

as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the use of interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging Congress to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish the several States of the Union with the records of the men from such States who entered the military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California regarding allotment to discharged soldiers, urging six months' pay to them on discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, against cancellation of loans made to foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging enactment of retirement legislation; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California urging legislation to restore to the pension rolls those who have given up right to pension by reentering service during present war; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MAHER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the early enactment of the water-power bill, now in conference; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting Congress to authorize the Secretary of War to leave in the State of New York, under proper supervision, such records as will furnish information regarding citizens of the State who have been inducted into the Federal service through the medium of the selective-draft law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relating to the fixing of the minimum price of wheat for 1919; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relating to the distribution of relics of the late war for the commemoration of soldier boys; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 15633) granting a pension to Albert Worthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 15634) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of United Mine Workers of America relative to the reducing of the price of coal; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, evidence to accompany H. R. 15602, for pension for Anna Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Ladies' Auxiliary, Bluebird Lodge, No. 116, to the International Machinists' Union, urging release of all conscientious objectors and amnesty for all political prisoners under war status, also repeal of espionage act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of residents of the third congressional district of Minnesota requesting guaranty of the price of wheat at \$2.26 per bushel for 1919 year crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Alameda County Civic Association, urging passage of appropriation for new post office at Oakland, Cal.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the trustees of Philadelphia Produce Exchange, asking Congress to determine the scope of work which the Bureau of Markets shall continue to perform; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of citizens of Waterville, Vt., protesting against the postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the New York State Legislature, Albany, N. Y., requesting legislation permitting the retention of draft-board information at the capitol of New York State as information pertaining to the State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Bronze Corporation, New York City, relating to Senate bill 5261; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the New York Produce Exchange, New York City, favoring removal of restrictions and discontinuing the practice of price fixing now applied to hogs, grain, and foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of railroad men, Muskogee, Okla., asking Government ownership and control of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of Rev. David N. Beech and other residents of Bangor, Me., urging repeal of the postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Harold M. Hill and other residents of Carland, Me., urging repeal of the postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Rev. C. H. Kern, of Wellsville, Ohio, and nine other citizens, protesting against postal and zone system and asking its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pittsburgh Board of Trade, requesting legislation for deportation of alien enemies and prohibition of entry of those who left the United States to enter the armed forces of the central powers; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution adopted by John Mitchell Literary Association, of Providence, R. I., urging passage of legislation favoring self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Hartford Council, No. 210, of the U. C. T. of America, relating to private ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of the teachers of Kent County, Del., favoring Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of the faculty of the State Normal School of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of citizens of Woburn, Mass., relating to self-determination of all nations, great and small, and especially of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of citizens of Isanti County, Minn., to repeal zone rate system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Minneapolis District Council, No. 8, C. T. W. A., demanding thorough investigation of the wire administration under Mr. Burleson, Postmaster General, with object of correcting conditions under which employees are working; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Minnesota Independent Telephone Association, asking that Congress fix a definite date to return telephone properties to the owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolutions of the Senate of the State of New York relative to records of local draft boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Senate of the State of New York relative to regulating the construction of the dams across navigable waters and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the use of the interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petition of Gust. C. Albrecht and other citizens of Fairfax, Minn., to make effective the guaranteed price for 1919 wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. B. Zimmerman and other citizens of Wellmar, Minn., for legislation to make good the guaranteed price of 1919 wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 5, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek from Thee that conscious power that comes with a clear vision, with a clean conscience, with a devoted and consecrated spirit to the ideal born out of Thy word. Grant to lead us to-day in the discharge of our duties. May we ever keep in mind the justice and righteousness and peace that Thou hast made known and which is Thy will concerning man. We ask it, for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, February 3, 1919, when, on request of Mr. SHEPARD and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

STATIONERY FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 379).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$41,000 for stationery, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 377).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Librarian of Congress submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,371.37 required to meet the increased cost of envelopes furnished the Library of Congress, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE (S. DOC. NO. 378).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the sum of \$9,220,000 required by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Acting Secretary of State (S. Doc. No. 375), the Secretary of the Interior (S. Doc. No. 374), and the Secretary of Commerce (S. Doc. No. 376), transmitting in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees in their respective departments on January 29 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which were ordered to lie on the table.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan ratifying the proposed prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15462) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PROPOSED WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, petitioning Congress for the enactment of the water-power bill now in conference between the two Houses.

This measure is of vital importance to the State of New York. It will afford an opportunity for a more effectual utilization of the water power at Niagara Falls, where already vast sums of money have been invested in anticipation of this legislation, and where additional power can be created, thereby saving a vast quantity of coal, cheapening production, and tending materially to the employment of labor.

The development of the upper Hudson River is also a subject of great concern to the people of New York.

It is proposed by one of the Nation's largest industries, when this bill becomes a law, to establish a great manufacturing plant at Green Island, above the city of Troy, where 25,000 men will be employed.

It is expected that the electricity generated at this point, through the damming of the river, and the tremendous power through the large volume of water coming from the upper reaches of the Hudson and the Mohawk will forever assure an uninterrupted power at a reasonable cost, not only for manufacturing plants in the immediate neighborhood but for the railroads and illuminating systems in that entire section of the State.

Let me assure the Senate conferees that there is no measure pending in this Congress of more immediate necessity.

We are constantly being asked to appropriate money to relieve possible business depression and assure the employment of labor. This bill will not only make possible the use of an almost unlimited natural resource and assure thereby an income to the country, but in addition, and what for the moment is more im-

portant, it will move the wheels of industry and employ thousands of men who are to-day walking the streets searching employment.

Let me urge again an early agreement on this very important question.

Mr. President, I send the petition to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE,
Albany, January 27, 1919.

Whereas a bill entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of the dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of the interstate and foreign commerce, passed the Senate December 14, 1917, and the House of Representatives September 5, 1918; and

Whereas Hon. JOHN K. SHIELDS, and Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, Hon. HENRY L. MYERS, Hon. KEY PITTMAN, Hon. KNUTE NELSON, and Hon. REED SMOOT, from the Senate, and Hon. THOMAS W. SIMS, Hon. SCOTT FERRIS, Hon. ASBURY F. LEVER, Hon. JOHN J. ESCH, Hon. WILLIAM L. LA FOLLETTE, and Hon. GILBERT N. HAUGEN, from the House of Representatives, have been appointed to confer and agree upon the terms of said bill; and

Whereas the water powers of the State are urgently needed for the promotion of industry:

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York earnestly request our Representatives in Congress and the conferees named to do all in their power to stimulate action on said bill, to the end that it may be acted upon favorably, providing, however, that the same does not in any way diminish or impair the rights of the State of New York in the ownership and control of such navigable waters.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, our Representatives in Senate and in the House, as well as the conferees named above.

By order of the senate:

ERNEST A. FAX, Clerk.

In assembly, January 30, 1919. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly:

FRED W. HAMMOND, Clerk.

Indorsed: Filed January 30, 1919.

FRANCIS M. HUGO,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Office of the secretary of state, ss:

I have compared the preceding copy of resolution relative to regulating the construction of the dams across navigable waters and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the use of the interstate and foreign commerce with the original resolution on file in this office, and do hereby certify that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Given under my hand and the seal of office of the secretary of state, at the city of Albany, this 30th day of January, in the year one thousand nine hundred and nineteen.

[SEAL.]

C. W. TAFT,
Second Deputy Secretary of State.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Spencer
Baird	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Sterling
Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	New	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Kellogg	Nugent	Swanson
Calder	Kendrick	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Penrose	Thompson
Colt	King	Pinckney	Townsend
Culberson	Kirby	Pollock	Trammell
Cummins	Knox	Pomeroy	Underwood
Curtis	La Follette	Reed	Vardaman
Dillingham	Lenroot	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fernald	Lewis	Saulsbury	Walsh
Fletcher	Lodge	Shafroth	Warren
France	McKellar	Sheppard	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Sherman	Weeks
Hale	McNary	Simmons	Wolcott
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.	
Henderson	Moses	Smoot	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan], who is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is absent on official business.

Mr. POMERENE. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] are detained on official business.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on account of illness.

Mr. MCKELLAR. My colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], is detained by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON. I present a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and properly referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution of the senate in relation to the Chippewa Indian tribal funds in hands of Federal Government.

Whereas the great majority of the people of Chippewa Indian blood residing in the State of Minnesota are citizens of said State and perform all the obligations imposed by the State upon all other citizens; and

Whereas the great majority of the Chippewa people in the State of Minnesota are, in the opinion of the Senate of Minnesota, capable of managing and controlling their property interests; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, through its Bureau of Indian Affairs, has maintained for a number of years, and is now maintaining, a large force of agents and employees in connection with the administration of said trust at a very considerable expense, which expense is being paid out of the trust funds of said Indians; and

Whereas we are of the opinion that the further maintenance of this force of agents and employees at the expense of said trust fund has become unnecessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to discontinue the use of said trust fund for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned, and that it be further requested to enact such legislation as will enable said Chippewa people to secure a final settlement of their tribal affairs with the United States Government, due regard being had for the well-being of said Indians; be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota be requested to assist in carrying out the purposes for which this resolution was designed; be it further

Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, that another be transmitted to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and that copies be sent to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota, and that as so amended the same do pass.

Mr. KIRBY. I present a memorial protesting against the passage of House bill 13400, giving certain riparian claimants the right to purchase certain public lands in Arkansas. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to a Federal constitutional amendment for woman suffrage, adopted on the 16th day of January, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution (J. Res. No. 4, A) relating to a Federal constitutional amendment for woman's suffrage.

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we indorse woman's suffrage, following the platforms of the political parties of this State, and favor that the Senate of the United States adopt the legislation now pending before it providing for submitting to the several States an amendment to the Federal Constitution establishing national woman's suffrage; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution, properly signed and attested by the officers of this legislature be forwarded to the United States Senate, and a copy thereof to each United States Senator.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITHMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Received January 30, 1919, 4.15 p. m.

MERLIN HULL, Secretary of State.

Mr. STERLING. I have here a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which relates to the interference of the Railroad Administration with express rates on shipments wholly within the State. It is of such interest and importance that I ask it may be read and then referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Certificate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, C. A. BURKHART, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed concurrent resolution was duly passed by the sixteenth session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, January 31, 1919.
[SEAL.]

C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State.

Hon. C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives:

Concurrent resolution.

"Whereas the Government of the United States, as a war emergency measure, took over the control of several great public-service corporations, including the railroads and express companies of our country, and placed them in charge of a Director General of Railroads; and

"Whereas our Government did at the same time urge upon our people the great necessity of saving and conserving in private and business affairs, and asked our people, even the widows and orphans, to save their mite to buy liberty bonds and war-savings stamps for the support of the Government and its different departments in its conduct of the war, including the railroads and express companies; and

"Whereas our people have generously responded to every request made; and

"Whereas it has now come to the attention of our people that three paid representatives of one of the said great public-service corporations have come to the city of Pierre in a luxuriously equipped private car, at a great and unnecessary expense, for the express purpose of opposing in our courts the action of our board of railroad commissioners, wherein they are representing the interests of our people in seeking to prevent what appears to be an unwarranted, unlawful, and unjust raise in express rates, which are sought to be put into effect under the guise of Government control and with the apparent approval of the Director General of Railroads: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do condemn such unwarranted extravagance as unpatriotic, disloyal, and undemocratic, and that we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such laws as will effectually and permanently protect the American people from unfair and extortionate rates, whether imposed upon them by private corporations owning and operating such public utilities or under Government management and control of the same, thereby rendering to the people that reasonable and efficient service to which they are rightfully entitled, free alike from unreasonable governmental control or from corporate or individual oppression."

For the senate:

C. S. AMSDEN,
President of the Senate.
A. B. BLAKE,
Secretary.

For the house:

LEWIS BENSON,
Speaker.
WRIGHT TARBELL,
Chief Clerk.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 28th day of January, A. D. 1919.

Mr. MOSES. I present a resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Association of Insurance Agents, protesting against further Government activity on behalf of farm fire insurance. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Association of Insurance Agents at their nineteenth annual meeting at Concord, N. H., January 20, 1919.

Whereas new evidences of paternalistic government are appearing in this country, with a steady encroachment upon the fields of private enterprises, and tangible obstructions to individual freedom and personal initiative are threatened; and

Whereas examples are contained in the second annual report of the Federal land banks urging the extension of their activities to farm fire insurance; and

Whereas the circulation of a textbook, entitled "Lessons in Community and Private Life," for introduction into the public schools, through the Secretary of the Interior, propagating social insurance and Government control of private activities, has aroused the protest of business interests; and

Whereas there has been a recent attempt to place workmen's compensation and liability coverage on shipbuilding plants along the Atlantic coast in the hands of a profit-sharing concern, utterly ignoring the agents in those States whose countersignatures would have been required; and

Whereas the prediction that bills will be introduced in every State legislature providing for monopolistic State workmen's compensation funds has been made; and

Whereas it has been proposed to extend Government life insurance to the entire civil list: Be it

Resolved, That we, the New Hampshire Association of Insurance Agents, assembled in annual meeting at Concord, N. H., January 20, 1919, earnestly protest against these paternalistic tendencies and vigorously urge local fire, casualty, surety, and life insurance agents everywhere to inform themselves of these propositions and activities calculated to undermine the foundations of our Government and throw into chaos long-established institutions, to the end that we may be able successfully to combat all Bolshevik tenets and socialist propaganda and make the United States safe for insurance democracy.

LOUIS G. MERRILL,
President.

Mr. MOSES. I also present a resolution of the New Hampshire Manufacturers' Association, protesting against further activity by the United States Employment Service, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Congress, under stress of war, created the United States Employment Service, the purpose of which was to give a specific directive power to Federal Government which would facilitate Congress to remedy those industrial and labor conditions in the United States while at war, and whereas the Department of Labor has or is about to ask Congress for an appropriation of nearly \$15,000,000 to continue this employment service for the next 12 months: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Hampshire Manufacturers' Association, in convention assembled, are opposed to the continuation of this employment service as being unnecessary, as the cause for which it was created has ceased to exist, and the continuation of this power is inimical to the public good.

Mr. LENROOT. I send to the desk a certified copy of a resolution of the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the pay of soldiers and sailors for a certain period after their discharge, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution indorsing movement to pay soldiers and sailors their salaries for certain period after their discharge.

Whereas the United States Government is now demobilizing the Army and Navy as rapidly as possible; and

Whereas many soldiers and sailors will hereafter from time to time be released from further duty to the Government and, until conditions again become normal, will be out of funds and work for sometime to come; and

Whereas a movement is on foot to pay soldiers and sailors their salaries for a certain period after their discharge; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, That it heartily indorses the movement to pay soldiers and sailors their salaries for a certain period after their discharge from further duties to their country, and hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation to the end that all soldiers and sailors released from further duty will receive three months' additional pay from the date of their discharge.

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Milwaukee, February 1, 1919.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee on January 27, 1919.
[SEAL.] P. F. LEUCH, City Clerk.

Mr. LENROOT. I also present a certified copy of a resolution of the common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., to eliminate unemployment. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution petitioning Congress to eliminate unemployment.

Whereas due to the closing down of the war industries, together with demobilization of the Army, there now exists a serious condition of unemployment which is growing worse from day to day; and

Whereas the working class of the United States was led to believe that after the close of this war the conditions of the workers would be materially improved; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the mayor and the common council of the city of Milwaukee do hereby petition and urge Congress to enact such legislation as will eliminate unemployment—

First. By compulsory reduction of the hours of labor for all classes of workers and the fixing of minimum wage scales; and

Second. By inaugurating a system of public work, such as construction of a modern system of transportation, utilization of the water power of our country, irrigation of arid lands, reforestation, clearing and breaking of land for agricultural purposes, etc.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to the House of Representatives, and to the Senate of the United States.

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Milwaukee, February 1, 1919.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Milwaukee on January 27, 1919.
[SEAL.] P. F. LEUCH, City Clerk.

Mr. NUGENT. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask to have read.

The memorial was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 4, which was filed in this office on the 30th day of January, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 30th day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

[Legislature of the State of Idaho, fifteenth session. In the senate. Senate joint memorial No. 4; substitute for joint memorial No. 2.]

To the honorable Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the State of Idaho has for approximately a quarter of a century permitted the exercise of the voting franchise by the women of this State and accorded to them equal political rights; and

Whereas woman's suffrage in this State has been conducive to good government, has purified our politics, made better homes, and the influence of Idaho's women exerted at the polls has been for the best interests of the State: Be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Idaho, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do hereby memorialize the Senate of the United States and respectfully urge that it adopt and pass House joint resolution No. 200, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; and be it

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Idaho be, and is hereby, requested to forward a copy of this memorial to the Senate of the United States and copies thereof to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 22d day of January, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 23d day of January, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 4 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

Indorsed: Received and filed January 30, 1919.

ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Joint Committee of the Churches and Synagogues of the State of Massachusetts favoring a league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented petitions of the Rotary Club of Fairmont; of the Berea & Slab Telephone Co., of Harrisville; of the Board of Trade of Pennsboro; and of the Business Men's Association of Grafton, all in the State of West Virginia, praying that the return to private ownership of telephone and telegraph lines be deferred until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper and safe procedure to be thereafter followed, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. MILLERS presented a petition of the Montana Grain Growers, of Great Falls, Mont., praying that a graduated minimum price to be paid for wheat be substituted in lieu of the flat minimum price now established, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRESIDENT MURLIN'S LETTER ON H. F. WARD.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, among the names reported by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which is investigating the general subject of German propaganda was included that of Prof. H. F. Ward as from Boston University. There is some reproach connected with such a publication upon institutions which have been loyal in a high degree. Prof. Ward is not connected with the Boston University, but is connected with the Union Theological Seminary, New York. I have a letter from President Murlin, of Boston University, stating that fact. It is very short, and I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITAS BOSTONIENSIS,
Boston, February 3, 1919.

Senator JOHN W. WEEKS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WEEKS: In the list of names reported by the Senate committee investigating the German propaganda is included that of Prof. Harry F. Ward as from Boston University. Prof. Ward resigned his position in Boston University last May and is now connected with Union Theological Seminary, New York. I trust you will see to it that your records are made according to these facts. I told a representative from the local bureau of investigation here in Boston all about this some 90 days ago, but for some reason they still have his name down as from Boston University, which, of course, is not correct.

Faithfully, yours,

L. H. MURLIN, President.

LETTER FROM MRS. IDA MAE WATERS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have a short letter from Mrs. Ida Mae Waters who, in the Washington Post, figured somewhat conspicuously at the recent meeting at the Poli Theater which has been the subject of some discussion here. She protests against the construction placed upon that meeting and asks that the letter which she writes me upon the subject may be incorporated in the RECORD. I make that request. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. It need not be read.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., February 4, 1919.

"HON. CHARLES S. THOMAS.

"MY DEAR SIR: The paper reports you as denouncing a meeting held at Poli's Theater on Sunday afternoon. It may or may not be true. If the report is untrue I crave pardon for bothering you. If true, I feel it my duty to give you a little information, as my name was mentioned in the article.

"First, about two weeks ago I personally interviewed a number of Senators and Representatives of both parties and told

them about the meeting which I helped to arrange. There was no secret about it. Leading men in both Houses knew of it. And on Friday last I personally brought to the Capitol cards and circulars announcing the meeting and gave them to Senators and Representatives and requested them to tell others. Also left some to be given to others.

"I did that because I wanted to have the American people know that our representatives were not opposed to the truth being known. Also that Congress might have an opportunity to get some things straight from persons who have been close to the people of Russia.

"Mr. Williams did not advocate Soviet government for America. He has been grossly misrepresented.

"I beg of you to call Mr. Williams before the Senate and know what he did say. It seems strange that persons so misrepresented as you Senators have been at times would be so willing to believe everything you read. Why did you not come and know the truth? Kings, queens, kaisers, and czars have ruled by divine right (so claimed) and naturally have drawn away from the people, but Congressmen who serve by the will of the people would do well to know the people and not depend upon newspapers for all of their information, since it is but a short time before they sink back into the mass. I ask that you make this letter as public as you did your condemnation.

"And know that I am an American of several generations of English and Scotch ancestry.

"America first' is my slogan.

"Respectfully,

IDA MAE WATERS."

RUSSIAN APPEAL.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present certain resolutions adopted by the Russians of New York City, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the supreme council of the peace conference in Paris has practically decided to enter into negotiations with the Bolshevik officials in Russia;

Whereas the supreme council has decided to meet the Bolshevik delegates as well as the delegates of the Russian loyal factions opposed to the Bolsheviks on the Princes Islands on the 15th of February, 1919;

Whereas in the opinion of the loyal Russian organizations the Bolsheviks, in signing a separate peace with the central powers at Brest-Litovsk, have committed an act of high treason toward Russia, as well as toward the allied cause in general;

Whereas, further, it has been proved that the Russian Soviet officials were on the pay roll of the Imperial German Government;

Whereas during the Bolshevik rule in Russia unspeakable terror has been going on, and thousands and thousands of innocent men, women, and children have been murdered by the Bolsheviks without any trial, and taking into consideration that the Soviet terror was condemned by President Wilson on the 21st of September, 1918, in his address to all the neutral governments;

Whereas the Bolsheviks have abolished all the fundamental principles of liberty and civilization in Russia;

Whereas the Bolshevik rule has proved to be the greatest and most irreparable misfortune in Russia's history;

Whereas it is contrary to the national dignity of the peoples of Russia to meet the allied representatives somewhere in the back yard of Europe;

Whereas the very idea of a joint meeting at which representatives of Trotsky on the one hand and the loyal Russians on the other would meet constitutes an offense to loyal and honest Russia;

Resolved, To appeal to public opinion of the United States and the allied nations and to emphasize:

(a) That the loyal Russian organizations in the United States believe that the above decision of the supreme council at the peace conference in Paris is a fatal and historical error which might affect in a most harmful manner the civilization of the whole world;

(b) That the above decision of the allied Governments is apt to strengthen the Bolshevik cause at the very moment when Trotsky's régime is on the verge of a complete collapse;

(c) That, notwithstanding the decision of the supreme council, the loyal Russian organizations feel their duty and will continue their fight against the Russian Bolshevik traitors; and

(d) Finally, that we are deeply convinced that the loyal Russian delegates should meet the allied representatives either in Paris or nowhere.

Executive Board of the General Committee of Russian National Defense (comprising 39 Russian organizations, societies, political groups, and professional unions, 5 Karpatho-Russian organizations, and the Consistory of the Greek Orthodox Church, with 250 branches in the United States and Canada), chairman, A. D. Semenovskiy; vice chairman, Lieut. Boris Brasol; members, Lieut. Commander P. E. Stogoff, Col. N. N. Koch, Rev. L. Tourkevich, Rev. P. Popoff; representatives of the Karpatho-Russians, Gataliak and Cherniak; secretaries, Capt. N. Vishnevsky, V. Shumsky. Voluntary Association of the Russian Army and Navy Officers in the United States, president, Col. I. Sidorkin. Union of Russian Engineers, president, Count S. Shullenberg; secretary, Engineer Osolin.

NEW YORK CITY, January 23, 1919.

PEACE POLICIES.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, in connection with some observations which I made in the Senate on Monday last, I ask

leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times, dated February 2, by Charles Selden.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUGHES DEMANDS MANDATE NOW—PREMIER SAYS AUSTRALIA WILL NOT AWAIT FUTURE LEAGUE'S ALLOCATION OF COLONIES—CAUSTIC IN INTERVIEW—COMPARES LOSSES OF COLONY IN WAR WITH AMERICA'S—ECHOES WORLD'S VOICE, SAYS LAUSANNE.

[By Charles Selden.]

PARIS, February 2.

Although France, in common with the other big powers, accepts provisionally the Wilson mandatory principle as to the German colonies, she does not like it. The conditions under which she indorses it are so vague that the door is left wide open for her to repudiate it if she does not approve its concrete application. But in the French press, which speaks the wishes of Clemenceau and Pichon rather than the avowed utterances of those statesmen themselves, this real attitude is indicated.

For example, several Paris papers make a hero and a martyr out of Premier Hughes, of Australia, because of his stubborn fight against the Wilson mandatory principle as applied to New Guinea. *Le Matin* this morning had a long article by Stephan Lausanne on the Hughes fight, the printing of which is significant as a protest against the American attitude on this phase of the peacemaking.

"He has begun an ardent, tenacious fight on the question of the German colonies in the Pacific," writes Lausanne of Hughes. "He is of those who demand the immediate liquidation and attribution of these colonies. He is not at all sure he has lost his fight. He certainly does not admit himself beaten."

Lausanne then quotes Hughes as follows:

"We have no objection in Australia to the mandate principle, but let the mandate define immediately what it gives and requires. You offer to rent a house and ask the price and responsibilities, whereupon you are told that will be determined by a council to convene one, two, or three years hence. So, until then, you can know nothing of what you pay to the rules regulating you.

"That is no solution of this German colony problem. I will not subscribe to it. We have already at the Quai d'Orsay a league of nations capable of deciding these questions.

"We have had more losses than America with her 100,000,000 people. When we have been asked to sacrifice ourselves in battle we did not demand the organization of an international tribunal to decide the battle. But now, after our people have paid with their lives to save the world, without hesitation, argument, or chicanery, we find a new form of procedure for reimbursing damages.

"It is something slow and vague. We are told it is not now the fate of the world that is to be decided. That is to come later.

"We will not await a league of nations that is to be born nobody knows when, where, or how.

"It is often said that those far away on the other side of the world did not appreciate immediately the grandeur of the course for which we began fighting in 1914. Australia is far away, but she understood immediately and sacrificed herself from the start. It was not at the eleventh hour that we came to the defense of civilization. We armed a tenth part of our male population of 5,000,000.

"The arbiters. I know not who, are convening I know not where, coming I know not whence."

In his own comment on this statement from Hughes, Lausanne calls it an echo of the voice of the world.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13056) to grant to citizens of Modoc County, Cal., the right to cut timber in the State of Nevada for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Modoc County, Cal., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 684) thereon.

Mr. HARDWICK, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13277) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 683) thereon.

DISTRICT JUDGE FOR TEXAS.

Mr. CULBERSON. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 5342) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern judicial district of the State of Texas, and I submit a report (No. 682) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the northern judicial district of the State of Texas, who shall possess the same powers, perform the same duties, and receive the same compensation and allowance as the present judge of said district.

SEC. 2. That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of the district judge for the northern district of Texas, senior in commission, such vacancy shall not be filled, and thereafter there shall be but one district judge in said district.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for the third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5536) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., a captured German supergun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 5537) to abolish the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and transfer the functions thereof to the Federal Reserve Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5538) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Austin, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 5539) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lynn, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITTMAN (for Mr. WILLIAMS):

A bill (S. 5540) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the National Military Park, Vicksburg, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 5541) to provide for publication by national banking associations and savings banks and trust companies of the reports of resources and liabilities and dividends required to be made by them to the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 5542) to amend section 5 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," enacted on the 29th day of June, 1906; to the Committee on Immigration.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment proposing to investigate the claim of Charles S. Hood, a Modoc Indian, for services in securing the restoration and enrollment of the Modoc Indians of Oklahoma as members of the Klamath Tribe of Indians of the State of Oregon, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLY OF POTASH.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit the following resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 440), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate as promptly as possible the following information:

1. The amount of potash consumption in the United States prior to 1914, the answer to specify the amounts used of the three grades, to wit, sulphate, muriate, and kainit.
2. The amount of the production of potash in the United States in 1918, the answer to indicate the amount of sulphate and muriate, respectively.
3. The amount of potash now on hand, and the ruling price per unit, and a comparison with the antebellum price.
4. The amount and kind of potash consumed in the tobacco industry prior to 1914, and since.
5. The amount and kind of potash consumed in the citrus industry prior to 1914, and since.
6. The amount and kind of potash consumed in the orchard business prior to 1914, and since.
7. The possible production of potash in the United States, cost, and kind.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, this is a serious situation. For four years or more our agricultural interests, and especially the fruit growing and the tobacco interests, have suffered for the lack of potash. It is one of the necessary elements of plant food, and I think we ought to inquire into the situation and have the inquiry cover the ground mentioned.

My understanding is that the annual consumption of potash in the United States prior to the war was, in tons, 250,000. This was a German article marketed in the form of muriate or sulphate of potash, running 48 per cent or higher and commanding about \$50 per ton, containing 48 per cent of potash. There was also a very low grade of potash goods known as kainit, which sold at a much lower price.

The entire production of potash in the United States during 1918 was, I am informed, about 60,000 tons, and containing a much lower percentage of potash than the German muriate and sulphate of potash goods; that the domestic article contains 22 per cent as against 48 per cent or more for the German muriate and sulphate. This domestic article was obtained from the salt lakes of Nebraska, from kelp weed and alunite rock, from skimmings of beet sugar, and from the deposits in the stacks of cement factories and blast furnaces.

Probably the greatest proportion of the domestic article is what is known as muriate of potash. Domestic sulphate of potash is obtained from the alunite rock of Utah and the furnace stacks of the Riverside Portland Cement Works in California. These two products are reported to be free from chloride and carbonite.

At the present time there are 30,000 tons of potash of all kinds stored at eastern points and containing 22 per cent of potash. This supply is held at about \$93.50 per ton, or at considerably more than 300 per cent than the German article brought before the war, having regard to the proportion of potash in each article. It is reported that there is no sale for this supply, due to the expectation that foreign sources will soon be available.

Chairman Hurley is credited with the intention of obtaining an immediate supply of potash from the Alsatian deposits now under French control. Mr. Hurley's announced intention was to ballast the transports with this article and thus make use of a cheap and quick means of transport. The French commission, however, has just announced that the needs of the French people must be first taken care of, and no potash would be available from that source until June, 1919.

The American press recently reported an offer from Germany to trade potash for food, and also that the offer had been refused on the ground that there was a sufficient supply in the United States. The blockade and the trading-with-the-enemy act would prevent the consummation of such a transaction, unless a convention could be arranged between the allies.

Would such a convention be justified by the need of potash to produce the food that the world stands in need of? For four years a scanty supply of potash has been doled out to the American consumers and the lands are generally lacking in this necessary element. The Florida growers ordinarily used a fertilizer containing 8 per cent of potash. Since the war many citrus growers have used no potash on account of high prices, and it has been practically impossible to obtain an article containing more than about 3 per cent, as the domestic supply of less than 25 per cent of the ante bellum consumption had to be parceled out.

Citrus growers customarily and probably invariably used sulphate of potash before 1914, and avoided the use of muriate as injurious. The same was true of tobacco growers. While there might be some doubt as to whether muriate of potash is injurious to citrus trees, although the almost invariable practice of the growers confirms the idea, there appears to be no doubt that sulphate of potash is the only form adapted to tobacco culture. It is said the chloride contained in muriate of potash burns the tobacco. It would seem that if muriate of potash is hurtful to citrus trees, it would be equally injurious to all kinds of fruit trees.

I have no exact information as to what part of the domestic production is sulphate of potash, though much the greater part of the annual production of 60,000 tons is probably muriate, since the only sulphate of potash is produced from the alunite rock of Arizona and the cement works of Riverside, Cal., both of which points are remote from the eastern coast.

It is claimed that the potash obtained from the salt lakes of Nebraska is free of chloride and can be used for any purpose that straight sulphate goods can be employed, and this may be true. This product does contain carbonite, which is absent from the sulphate goods.

Inquiry would probably show that the production of sulphate of potash in the United States is entirely insufficient to supply the tobacco growers alone.

I ask that the resolution be adopted in order that this inquiry may be made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

MEDALS AWARDED COLORADO SOLDIERS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the headlines of an article in the New York Times, relating to our boys who were on the firing line in France. It says:

Forty-one of our heroes get highest honors—Congressional medals awarded by Pershing to 8 officers and 33 enlisted men—Many in the list are dead—Numerous instances of machine-gun nests being attacked in Argonne fighting.

Mr. President, I want to direct attention to the fact that out of the 41 who have been honored with this highest medal that can be awarded in the war four of the boys were from Colorado. I will give the names and the rank of these boys.

Capt. Marcellus H. Chiles (deceased), Denver. Three hundred and sixty-fifth Infantry, who led the battalion he commanded forward against a machine-gun cross fire, wading waist deep across a stream to reach the enemy and crawling on his hands to follow. He died of his wounds, and he was 23 years old.

Second Lieut. J. Hunter Wickersham, 3416 Colfax Avenue, Denver, Three hundred and fifty-third Infantry, ordered and led an advance of his platoon after his right arm had been crippled by shell fragments, and continued firing his revolver with his left hand until he fell from loss of blood. He died before aid could reach him.

Sergt. Harold I. Johnston, Denver, and Pvt. David R. Berkeley, San Antonio, Tex., Company A, Three hundred and fifty-sixth Infantry, for swimming the River Meuse to obtain information as to the enemy's position on the opposite side.

Pvts. Jesse N. Funk, Calhan, Colo., and Charles D. Garger, Stotts City, Mo., Company L, Three hundred and sixty-fifth Infantry, for rescuing wounded 500 yards in front of the American line, making two trips as stretcher bearers under machine-gun fire.

Mr. President, in bringing this record to the attention of the Senate my object is only to render deserved tribute to the gallantry and heroism of the boys from my own State. It is not that they excelled others in the qualities of virtue and courage, which have so gloriously won for our cause, but the heroic deeds of these lads, the sons of my neighbors and friends, naturally carry an especial appeal to me, and I am impelled to make public acknowledgment of the pride I feel over their accomplishments. It is perhaps only a circumstance—an unusual one, though—that of the 41 to receive the distinguished honor, 4 came from Colorado, a State of 1,000,000 population, or 1 per cent of the total of the Nation. Our pride is enhanced by the fact that our boys represented 10 per cent in the congressional-medal list.

I would add only that the fiery ardor of these boys, the spirit which sustained them as they cheerfully went to the supreme sacrifice for their country, was part of their education and their training. It was breathed to them in their homes, and it was taught to them in their schools. They carried with them the spirit of their State in the ultimate offering they gave to their country.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think no one would care to detract in any way from the gallantry of the sons of Colorado, but the Senator should remember that this is only one of several lists to whom medals have been given for gallantry in action, and some of the lists may contain a preponderance of names of sons of other States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. This is the only one that has been issued up to this time, as I understand it.

SHIP WORKERS' STRIKE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask that two articles which I have in my hand may be printed in the RECORD. We have had in our State a strike of shipyard workers for some time, and it is possible that that strike extended all over the State this morning.

I have here an interview given out by Mr. Piez, the director general of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, with reference to this controversy, and also a statement that he issued and had published as the Government's side of the controversy. I ask that both these may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMAS. Where is the strike?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The strike is in the shipyards on the Pacific coast, especially the Northwest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SHIP WORKERS' STRIKE—FACTS THAT THE MEN MUST RECOGNIZE.

Is an agreement solemnly entered into between representatives of the Government and representatives of the shipyard workers a covenant that is binding on both sides—binding on every individual represented therein—or is it to be broken at will?

Do the men in the shipyards realize that the question of wages in the yards is not one between the shipyard workers and the yard owners but is between the shipyard workers and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, representing the Government of the United States?

Do the men in the yards realize that both the Government on one hand and the men on the other have, during the life of the shipbuilding labor adjustment agreement, the so-called Macy agreement, surrendered final decision on all matters of wages, hours, and conditions to the determination of three men—one representing the people of the United States and appointed by the President of the United States, one appointed by Samuel Gompers, representing the shipyard workers, and one appointed jointly by the Navy and the Emergency Fleet Corporation?

Do the men appreciate that this agreement was drawn up after the most careful consideration in August, 1917, which was amended after a week's conference in December, 1917, attended by Mr. Gompers, the international presidents and delegates from Seattle and San Francisco Metal Trades Council; that it was signed by representatives of the Navy, the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and on behalf of the men by the international presidents?

The present agreement is as perfect an instrument for adjudicating industrial differences as has yet been devised. It provides all of the machinery necessary. It is complete. There is no room for outside mediation. It is final and binding on both sides. In order to give either side redress the awards are made for relatively short periods only, so that an unfair decision can not be long continued.

The decisions and awards of the Macy board have resulted in wage increases that will cost the Government more than \$300,000,000 on the shipbuilding program, yet the Government has unflinchingly accepted the burden which the board's decision has imposed on it.

In the present case the rates have been fixed by the Macy board, not only for the Pacific coast but for the Great Lakes, the Atlantic and Gulf yards as well. The appeal from the decision of the board to the board of appeal failed. The decision is final, because no other opportunity for reopening the case exists until after March 31, when the present award expires.

Are the men going to stick to their side of the bargain? That is the question at issue. And if they do not, is there any assurance that any agreement hereafter can be considered binding?

The Emergency Fleet Corporation considers itself bound by its agreement with labor to observe the existing award until its expiration. It can consent to no changes, no modifications, in one district without breaking faith with the men in all other districts. It must, therefore, insist that the award be carried out to its termination.

While the armistice ended hostilities, it did not end the shipbuilding labor adjustment agreement.

The shipyard workers of the Seattle district gave such an excellent account of themselves during the war and impressed me so strongly as sane, loyal, conscientious Americans that I appeal to their sense of fairness to go back to work and stick by the agreement until it expires on March 31. In the meantime a joint conference can determine what is to be done after that period.

A statement of the future plans of the Emergency Fleet Corporation will appear in this space to-morrow.

CHARLES PIEZ,
Director General United States Shipping
Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

PHILADELPHIA, February 2, 1919.

Statement No. 1. (Statement by Charles Piez, director general Emergency Fleet Corporation, published as an advertisement in the Pacific coast newspapers.) February 3, 1918.

[Interview sent out for Pacific coast papers for Sunday morning, Feb. 2, 1919.]

Charles Piez, director general of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, to-day authorized the following statement in regard to the strike of shipyard workers on the Pacific coast:

"The strike is a direct violation of a solemn contract entered into by the American Federation of Labor, representing the shipyard workers, the United States Navy, and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

"The men involved in the strike should realize that the emergency of war is past and that the need of ships is not as great as while the war was in progress.

"The increasing cost of shipbuilding in America, influenced largely by the constantly increasing labor cost, threatens the very future of the industry in this country, unless the output is brought proportionately up to the elevated wage scale.

"It is inconceivable that American working men would deliberately jeopardize their own interests, the interests of their communities, and the interests of the Nation by breaking an agreement. I can not believe they understand the situation.

"The Emergency Fleet Corporation, as trustee of the money of the people of the United States, can not compromise a vital moral principle. It is bound by an agreement with the shipyard workers throughout the country which is irrevocable, except through modification by mutual consent.

"The Shipbuilding Labor Adjustment Board, popularly known as the Macy Board, is the tribunal before which the shipyard workers, the Navy Department, and the Emergency Fleet Corporation agreed to submit all questions involving wages, hours, and working conditions. In striking before the expiration of the Macy award, which fixed the rate of wages to be paid up to March 31, 1919, the men were guilty of a breach of agreement solemnly entered into by their international presidents, and by this action they have repudiated the verdict of the supreme tribunal they helped to create.

"The decisions of this tribunal have been and must continue to be binding upon the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the workers alike. So long as the workers remain away from their posts the Emergency Fleet Corporation can not treat with them.

"The original agreement, which was entered into in August, 1917, and which created the Macy Board, was a joint compact by the unions, the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and the Navy. It was amended in December, 1917, and in this final form was signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Acting Secretary of the Navy; Charles Piez, of the Emergency Fleet Corporation; William Blackman, of the Emergency Fleet Corporation; James O'Connell, president of the Metal Trades Department; John I. Noland, of the International Molders' Union of North America; J. R. Franklin, international president Boiler Makers, Iron Shipbuilders of America; James Wilson, president Pattern Makers' League of North America; Milton Snellings, general president International Union of Steam and Operating Engineers; W. C. Van Dornes, general vice president International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers; E. D. McNulty, by J. J. P., I. B. E. of W.; John J. Hynes, president Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers of America; and William H. Johnson, International Association of Machinists, per P. Flaherty.

"This agreement provided for the appointment of a board to adjust all differences; such board to consist of three persons, one to represent the public, to be appointed by the President of the United States; one to be appointed by Samuel Gompers, representing the American Federation of Labor; and one to be appointed jointly by the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Navy.

"The President of the United States placed his influence behind the enterprise by appointing the chairman of the board.

"This agreement further provided that 'the decisions of the board will, in so far as this agreement may be capable of achieving such results, be final and binding upon all parties: Provided, however, That either the employers or employees may have the right to appeal from the decisions of the adjustment board to a board of review and appeal made up as follows: Three members to be named jointly by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and the United States Navy Department, and three to be named by the president of the American Federation of Labor.'

"The Shipbuilding Labor Adjustment Board as created consisted of Mr. Berres, appointed by Samuel Gompers, and Mr. V. Everett Macy, appointed by the President of the United States, and Mr. Louis A. Coolidge, appointed by the Navy and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. A decision and award was rendered effective February 1, 1918. Another decision and award was rendered effective August 1, 1918, which is the latest

award under the agreement. The decision provided that the award of August 1 should remain effective until March 31, 1919.

"The first award was handed down by the Macy Board in November, 1917, for the Pacific coast, but aroused so much discontent that an appeal was taken directly to the executive officers of the Navy and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. This award, which was retroactive to August 1, 1917, fixed a wage of \$5.25 for skilled crafts. A temporary increase was granted by the executive officers of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, amounting to 10 per cent, and making the rate for skilled crafts \$5.77½ per day. This increase was ratified by the Macy Board on February 1, 1918. The rate for laborers and helpers was raised in greater proportion than that for skilled crafts.

"The Macy Board was appealed to on August 1, 1918, for a review of the wage rates, and at that time a rate of \$8 per day was demanded for skilled crafts. The Macy Board found that the increases asked for were not justified by the advances in the cost of living and a new set of rates was awarded, granting the skilled crafts \$6.40 a day. Intermediate positions were granted a proportionate increase. An appeal was taken from the Macy Board's decision to the board of review and appeal. This board, after a hearing extending over 11 days, disagreed and dissolved without decision.

"It was the intent of those framing the Macy agreement that the appeal board should be evenly divided, because a decision overruling the Macy Board's decision should be granted only when there was most convincing evidence of the errors of its decision. Inasmuch as the men failed to have their appeal sustained, the Macy decision, as effective August 1, 1918, and expiring March 31, 1919, stands.

"The question that now arises is whether by reason of strength and perfection of organization the men in one district can dictate wages that are materially higher than those that the increased cost of living would justify. Justification for such action does not exist in the agreement and could not be taken account of by the Macy Board.

"The ship workers nobly acquitted themselves of their obligations during the war by adhering to the decisions of the board. It is only right that they should continue to adhere to their obligations until the agreement expires on April 1, two months hence.

"The Emergency Fleet Corporation can not deal with the men until they have gone back to work and until they have applied for a modification or amendment of the shipbuilders' labor adjustment (Macy) agreement through the regular channels established by the agreement."

CHARLES FIEZ.

WYOMING NATIONAL FOREST.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1847) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest, which was, on page 1, line 6, after "may," to insert "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Wyoming please explain to the Senate what the House amendment proposes or what change is contemplated in the bill by the amendment?

Mr. KENDRICK. The only change made in the bill as it passed the Senate is the insertion of the words "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment of the House.

The amendment was concurred in.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15462. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BRITISH PROHIBITION OF AMERICAN PRODUCTS.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I ask to take from the table and that immediate consideration be given to the resolution which I submitted yesterday, relative to the prohibition of the importation of certain articles into Great Britain. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 438) was read, as follows:

Whereas during the war with the Imperial German Government Great Britain placed prohibitions on the importation of certain American products; and

Whereas the British Government has recently placed a prohibition on the importation of additional American products to take effect on and after March 1, 1919, which is detrimental to the employment at their full capacity of our manufacturing industries; and

Whereas this action of the British Government is in direct conflict with point No. 3 of the 14 points of peace proposed in the message of the President of the United States to the Congress of January 8, 1918: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, what steps, if any, have been taken by the Department of State to request the British Government to modify or suspend such prohibition.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, during the continuance of the war with Germany the British Government, as a war measure, placed a prohibition on the importation of certain articles into Great Britain which were largely manufactured in this country. As an example of this and as indicative of the list, a prohibition was placed on the importation of shoes. This country had had a large business in all European countries before the war in American-made shoes. We have for a great many years manufactured a better-fitting shoe and a better shoe than have other countries, and therefore, notwithstanding the disparity

in the cost of manufacture in this country, we have been able to build up a very considerable trade. The exportation of shoes from the United States to Great Britain a year or two before the outbreak of the war—I do not recall the figures for the year immediately preceding the war—amounted to nearly \$1,000,000. More than two years ago this prohibition on the importation of shoes was suspended; but now other articles are being included in that list, with the purpose, as stated by the British Government, of reconstructing and building up the industries of Great Britain until they have been restored to normal condition.

It is hardly necessary, Mr. President, for me to call the attention of Senators to the fact that this process of building up and reconstructing British industries has directly the reverse effect on our industries, because during the time all importations are prohibited into Great Britain we are going to manufacture less to the extent that the British industries are increased.

I had supposed that after the termination of the war, or at this time, such prohibitions would be suspended; and I was surprised to find three or four days ago that the list was greatly extended, so that it becomes a matter of vital importance to the manufacturing industries of this country.

I wish now to send to the desk and ask to have read from the Official Bulletin a list of the additional articles the prohibition of the importation of which into Great Britain will go into effect on the 1st of March.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Aluminum, manufactures of.
Aluminum powder.
Apparel not waterproofed.
Baskets and basket ware.
Baths of metal, all kinds.
Cartridges, all kinds, and parts thereof.
Cement.
Diatomite, or infusorial earth.
Electrotypes.
Fatty acids.
Fire extinguishers.
Guns, carbines, and rifles.
Hats and bonnets.
Lawn mowers.
Linen yarns and manufactures thereof.
Machine tools and machinery driven by power and suitable for use in cutting, stamping, or working metal, including lathes, grinding machines, milling machines, boring and turning mills, drilling machines, power presses, planers, punching and shearing machines, shapers, forging machines, screw machines, cutting-off machines, chucking machines, gear-cutting machines, boring machines, centering machines, slotting machines.

Machinery driven by power and suitable for use in cutting, working, or operating on wood, including sawing machines of all descriptions, general joiners, mortise, tenon, boring machines, lathes and rounding machines, box and cask making machines, and all machines accessory thereto, scraping and sandpapering machines, wheelwright machinery, firewood making and bundling machinery; wood, wood fiber, and pulp machinery; saw sharpening and setting machines; saw stretchers; and brazing apparatus.

Machines for grinding, planing, or molding irons.
Mats.
Matting.
Methyl alcohol.
Mops.
Mouth organs.
Oilcloth.
Perfumery and toilet preparations.
Photographic apparatus.
Pictures, prints, engravings, and photographs.
Plating, all descriptions.
Plated and gilt wares.
Revolvers and pistols.
Salt.
Sewing machines.
Skins and furs, manufactures of.
Slide rules for engineers and draftsmen.
Stereoscopes.
Stoves and ranges.
Straw envelopes for bottles.
Soap.
Spectacles and eyeglasses complete, not containing gold.
Time-recording instruments of all kinds, and movements and parts thereof.
Vacuum cleaners.
Wringers and mangles.
Weighing machines, scales, and balances of all descriptions.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I do not introduce this resolution in any spirit of antagonism to Great Britain, but I do it for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Senate how very greatly our foreign trade may be affected by this additional prohibition, which includes the great variety of articles mentioned in the list just read. I think the time has come when we must give some attention to our own domestic affairs, when we must determine whether we are going to protect our foreign commerce. Possibly something is being done in connection with this subject by the State Department, but I think it is proper that the Senate should be informed what action, if any, has been

taken or is being taken relative to this action of the British Government. I do not charge that this action is aimed at the United States. It is general, if I am correctly informed; but it is a process of attempting to build up British industries, and, of course, at the expense of those who have sent similar goods into that territory.

I hope the resolution will not be opposed.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, knowing that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] as chairman of the Elections Committee has an important matter to be brought up at once, I will not occupy the floor to his disadvantage. I beg the indulgence of the Senate for a moment, however, to say that my colleague [Mr. SHERMAN] and myself are in receipt of many protests from the manufacturing interests of the West against this embargo, particularly from those of the State of Illinois, which we represent. While the eminent Senator from Massachusetts says that he will not charge that this embargo is addressed against the United States, in which, of course, there is great merit, I deplore to say that in the West they have been able to point out that those particular articles which are the objects of the embargo in the majority are those that are manufactured in the Middle West, and which in great quantities heretofore have been shipped from the United States to England.

Mr. President, I concur with the Senator from Massachusetts in the trust that the State Department may make such appropriate investigation of the subject as it can, and make such reply to the resolution as will inform us what steps the State Department feels it proper and just, under the circumstances, to take. And now, Mr. President, I feel that it is not out of place for a Member of this body to invite at this time to the attention of England the delicate situation she is creating here in the United States. While the President is there in France, battling for principles which our country feels are to its welfare, to have one of the countries of the allies take a course so inimical to the welfare of the United States is calculated to arouse a sentiment of hostility from certain people in our country which will embarrass harmony in the United States upon whatever the President may conclude.

The Senator from Massachusetts is accurate when he calls attention to the fact that this embargo inveighs directly against the statement of the President of the United States opposing any policy which erects barriers to just trade between nations. Now, Mr. President, the English Government say that our policy is one of a protective tariff; that by a tariff we keep their goods out of our market, to build up our home market; that they have a right to keep our goods out of their market.

The parallel is not just. We levy a form of tariff, but we do not put an unconditional and unlimited embargo upon their goods. They need only pay that tariff to enter into our markets completely; but the policy of England is an absolute embargo, without qualification, and that embargo, as the western manufacturers have informed my distinguished colleague and myself from Illinois, particularly operates against the great Middle West.

Mr. President, I beg to submit the suggestion that Britain does this country a great violence at this time by pressing that embargo. First, she will awaken in the United States a sentiment that will make it very difficult for the President of the United States to succeed in those things with which all of our people wish him well, sir. Second, she will awaken hostility from a certain set of very estimable citizens in the United States, and, third, a war of protest from these against the policy undertaken by Britain. That war of protest will find its way to both Chambers of Congress, and will lead to retaliatory legislation on the part of the United States. Then before we know it we will have that economic condition of trade hostility between the United States and Britain; and then, sir, instead of having a calm peace of the world between ourselves and our allies we will have awakened an atmosphere of enmity, making impossible the very peace of the future for which we strive.

For myself I have one parting word which I dare offer to the British officials, knowing that the British plain people have a common sentiment for friendship and future harmony along with our plain people. It is this, that unless there is a very great necessity of self-preservation on the part of Britain I pray her official set to recall the struggle we had to enter upon in 1812 and 1814 to oppose English embargo to our impoverishment. We beg England not to unnecessarily reawaken the old resentful spirit of 1812 in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to give my most cordial support to this resolution. While we are expressing our good feelings toward the people of all lands, and extending to them earnest sympathy and assurance of our desire for their happiness and prosperity, we must realize that the first duty of a government is to its own people, and I believe it to be

our duty to take care of the United States and the people of the United States. Great commercial problems confront our people. We must guard their interests by wise and fearless action.

I support with pleasure the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. REED addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator yield to me to make a suggestion to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wanted to suggest that if the Senator from Missouri is to proceed, this resolution will go to the calendar, unless the Senator from Massachusetts gets unanimous consent that it shall go over without prejudice until to-morrow.

Mr. REED. I hope that unanimous consent will be given.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may go over until to-morrow without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BOLSHEVIST PROPAGANDA IN WASHINGTON.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator from Missouri will yield for a moment, I should like to ask unanimous consent to take up another resolution which came over from yesterday.

Mr. REED. I will be through in three minutes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think this will occupy only a moment.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If there is any objection to it, of course I shall not insist on it. I ask that resolution 437 may be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will state the resolution.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 437, calling upon the Attorney General for information as to what investigation is being made by the Department of Justice relative to certain meetings recently held in Washington City at which public speakers advocated the cause of the present Bolshevik government of Russia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to. There was no objection.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

BRITISH PROHIBITION OF AMERICAN PRODUCTS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate resolution No. 438, submitted yesterday by Mr. WEEKS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not know that anything I may say on this resolution will serve any other purpose except to keep it that many more minutes before the Senate. I want the resolution passed, but I do not want to see its passage regarded as a mere formality.

We have recently had a great deal of talk about the brotherhood of man, a great deal of talk that is in the teeth of all history. It is time we began to take a sane view of life, and this resolution will serve a useful purpose in giving us that jolt which is sometimes necessary to awaken an individual from a sound slumber even though it disturb the gentle course of pleasant dreams.

We as a Nation are suffering from voluntary auto-intoxication. We impose upon ourselves the idea that we are in love with all the world and that all the world is in love with us. We hypnotize ourselves with the charming thought that we have suddenly become perfectly good and perfectly unselfish, and that all the rest of the world had a change of heart at the same time we did. We are trying to convince ourselves that the day has come when the lion and the lamb may be observed serenely sleeping upon every hillside and when little children may be found leading the beasts of prey. But this dream will be rudely dispelled. Those who seek to impose it upon our people will in the end find they have done their country a disservice.

Every time a false doctrine is taught it brings bad results. No healing herb springs from the poison soil of falsehood. No general good springs from the denial of truth.

There were a lot of people who a few years ago went about preaching the doctrine in France that there was no danger to France from Germany. They declared that the frosts of selfishness in all human hearts had by the gentle spirit of Christ been transformed into sweet dews of kindness. They taught France

that she need not arm, alleging that no nation dare in the face of enlightened Christianity make war upon its neighbors. For a time France was lulled into a partial slumber. While she thus slept Germany was inventing deadly gases, forging and perfecting plans for the advance upon Paris she had so long contemplated. It was not until Europe shook beneath the tread of the embattled legions of the Kaiser in preparation for war that a French statesman and a few French publicists succeeded in arousing France to her danger.

Universal military training was adopted. It had not reached full development when the German invasion began. But for the fact that a few men did succeed in awakening the French from their dream of peace and security Paris would have been conquered and the Republic of France would now be under the foot of the German.

Just before war came an Englishman succeeded in awakening the English Government enough to cause her to equip her little army and to cause a partial mobilization of the English fleet. It required that preparation and sound foresight, added to the French awakening, to save England as well as France.

What is new about these cries we are hearing? Six or eight years ago the Carnegie Foundation, a concern that I unhesitatingly say ought to be dissolved, employed a generous part of its enormous fund to create a world-wide organization for the purpose of promoting eternal peace.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is referring to the Peace Foundation?

Mr. REED. Yes; did I miscall the name?

Mr. LODGE. No; you simply left out the word "peace."

Mr. REED. This organization had had its branches in every country. The branches in countries outside the United States were comprised of the subjects of foreign countries. These aliens were severally and jointly conspiring to control the policy of their respective countries. They were likewise conspiring with the Carnegie Peace Foundation to control the policy of the United States. I do not hesitate to sharply raise the question of loyalty against any American organization that conspires with Germans or other foreigners to change the foreign or domestic policy of our Government. I gravely doubt the loyalty of that course of conduct.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. One moment. It might lead to any extreme, to any abuse, and it might end in a world-wide conspiracy to undermine the very foundations of the American Republic. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that it was disclosed before some committee of Congress several years ago that after the people of the United States, in the most significant and emphatic way, had expressed their opinion that we had the right to send our coastwise ships through the Panama Canal without paying toll, and after the three great political parties had written into their platform that proposition, and the three candidates for the Presidency of the United States had declared in favor of it on the stump, after the Congress of the United States had enacted it into law, and after the State Department had taken the matter up diplomatically with Great Britain, this Carnegie peace organization spent \$25,000 or \$30,000 in circulating literature to procure the repeal of that act.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for his historical sketch. I am wondering if the Senator can not also tell us whether it is a fact that the agitation for the repeal of the free-of-tolls law began with Canadian shipping or business interests?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania is just a little incomplete. I think he should have added that the literature circulated was the speech of the great New York Senator, Mr. Elihu Root, upon the floor of the Senate, in favor of that repeal.

Mr. REED. I know that is true; that is, I know that that was a part of the expense, but I addressed an inquiry to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the failure of the Democratic Party to keep its platform to the people of the United States, which pledge plainly was to give freedom from tolls, did more to undermine the confidence of the people in the Democratic Party than any other act ever performed. It is the one thing which is a blot upon the splendid record of the Democratic Party. It was a shameful and foul betrayal of the people when we broke our platform on that point.

Mr. REED. "Shake not thy gory locks at me; thou canst not say I did it." The Record will show I voted against the repeal.

Mr. ASHURST. So did I.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. My vote was cast against that right along, but I think it is well to remind the people that the vote which carried the measure was Democratic and Republican.

Mr. REED. I think that is only a fair statement; but I return to my interrogatory addressed to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. REED. I asked the Senator whether he was not able to inform us that the agitation for the repeal of the free-of-tolls law did not really originate with the shipping interests of Canada and was by them carried to the British Government and by it referred to Ambassador Bryce. I am going to be frank with the Senator. I am asking the question because I have been told the Senator has such information.

Mr. KNOX. My recollection is, and my recollection is quite clear upon the subject, that it began with a protest by the British Government filed by the counselor of the British Embassy in the absence of Mr. Bryce, who at that time was the ambassador. The matter was in process of adjustment, and I thought at that time, and think now, there could have been an amicable adjustment of the question with Great Britain, because we had represented to Great Britain diplomatically, in an elaborate note upon the subject, that the question of the passage of our own ships was a domestic question; that their ships were not entitled to enter into that trade at all. I think, and I thought then, that Great Britain would have withdrawn her protest until she was reinspired by the Canadian shipping interests. Then we offered to arbitrate the matter under the treaty that had just been signed between Great Britain and the United States but the ratifications of which had not been exchanged because of several amendments put upon the treaty, by the Senate. We offered to ratify the treaty, notwithstanding those amendments, although they were not very acceptable to the Taft administration, but we concluded if we could settle the tolls question we had better waive our scruples upon the amendments, and we tendered to Great Britain the offer to exchange ratifications and arbitrate under the provisions of that treaty. Great Britain refused, and I think the reason why she refused was that the arbitration would have had to have been provided for by a treaty requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate, whereas a repeal of the bill would only require a majority vote.

Mr. REED. That, I think, justifies me in asking the question.

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I must take sharp issue with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] on the statement that the repeal of the Panama Canal toll exemption for our coastwise shipping affected the Democratic Party disastrously. That action was taken in June, 1914, and at the two general elections thereafter, the election of 1914 and the election of 1916, the Democratic Party was successful. It carried a majority of Congress in 1914, and in 1916 it reelected President Wilson with a Democratic majority in both branches of Congress. Not until 1918 did the Democratic Party suffer any reversal of its fortunes at the polls, but two successful elections intervened between that time and the time of the action on the Panama Canal tolls question.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me to respond?

Mr. REED. If for no other reason than that it illustrates the fact that there is still such a thing as contention in the world, I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not want to take the Senator's time, but will say in reply to my friend from Montana that while we carried the elections in 1914 and in 1916, nevertheless the Democratic speakers were in an apologetic attitude when the question of tolls was presented. I do not think I made any votes, but I went up and down this country like a peripatetic volcano in 1914 and 1916 urging the people to vote the Democratic ticket, and I was frequently asked uncomfortable questions about our betrayal of the people on the Panama Canal tolls question. The people would have had firmer faith in the Democratic Party if it had kept its pledges on the tolls question. The fact that the Democratic Party was successful in two elections afterwards does not bring back the confidence of the people. A

promise to the people is a promise, a pledge in a Democratic platform is a pledge, and a violation of a pledge by the Democratic Party is a worse offense than by the Republican Party, because the Democratic Party knows better. [Manifestations of applause in the gallery.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the occupants of the galleries that any disorder in the galleries as well as on the floor is against the rules of the Senate, and the Chair will not hesitate to order the galleries cleared if it becomes necessary.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. If the Senator will just permit me to make one observation in confirmation of the statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Arizona to the fact that the reason why it hurt him so bad was that President Wilson in his campaign speeches used his party's pledge to support that legislation in connection with his observation that the Democratic platform pledges were not molasses with which to catch flies.

Mr. MYERS. I will say that the President caught a reelection in 1916, though.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we are getting away from the question I was trying to discuss, and having wandered this far into a June grass pasture, may I be permitted to pause long enough to remark: If you were seeking to ascertain to which party the honors on this question lay I think you would have some difficulty in deciding the case. This question had been settled by the action of Congress. Both political parties had ratified and approved the action. The question seemed to be at rest. It was resurrected by the great Senator from New York in a speech that will long be remembered for two reasons, first, for its power, and second, because it apparently required more than an ordinary amount of nerve to make it, for he was asking Congress to reverse its action, and the country to reverse its action, upon a matter which had been settled at a previous Congress.

The speech which he made was, as stated, circulated, I think, by some hundreds of thousands of copies all over the United States. A well-financed propaganda got under way; the ground was thus prepared. The President in his message stated to us, as I recall his language, that he did not know how to deal with certain difficult problems if this request was not granted. So both parties had to do with this business. I did not, however, intend to discuss that at all. It is a side issue.

But I do call attention to the existence of organizations that have for their business the intriguing with similar organizations in other countries to control the policy of this country. That is going on, and it was going on in this great prewar peace movement. If anybody wants to know what was the matter with our country, if there was anything at all the matter with it during the early days of the European war, he would have no difficulty in finding that a great lot of very good people had been going around this country preaching the doctrine that there never would again be any great war. They convinced many of our people, yet their teachings turned out to be absolutely false.

I remember that when Mr. Bryan wrote his celebrated peace treaties he had a lot of old Army sabers gathered together. He caused the blades to be cut off from the hilts. He then had the blades beaten into little plowshares and presented a plowshare to the representatives of each of the countries that had signed the treaties. He then presented the hilts of the sabers to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Thus we were literally carrying out the Scripture maxim, "They shall beat their swords into plowshares." I believe he did not furnish any pruning hooks, doubtless because there was no raw material in the shape of spears to be found.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand there was a large amount of gun metal that was melted up into paper weights as souvenirs of those warlike weapons and presented to distinguished people throughout the country.

Mr. REED. Perhaps so; but I do not say this now to bring an embittered thought into this body against Mr. Bryan or against any of the good people who went up and down the world saying, "Behold now; turn your eyes to the East, where the glorious rays of the sun of the millenium are gilding the horizon and the full effulgence of the wondrous orb will soon break upon the earth." They were sincere and as enthusiastic as a new convert at a revival meeting. But, sir, while we were burning incense to the gods of peace Germany and other countries were molding cannon in the furnaces of Vulcan. While we were swinging censers and singing, "Peace on earth,

good will to men," their mighty arms were forging the implements of destruction.

That dream slightly transformed is the one they are now trying to realize over in Europe—a supnation, a brotherhood, a unity of heart and soul, a common control of all the destinies of all the races of men.

We are perhaps to be asked to cross 5,000 miles of sea and land and take charge of Turkey. That is the suggestion. It may or may not come to pass; but if it does come to pass—and it has been seriously discussed in the international debating society now in session—if that does come to pass, then the American soldier can be sent over to Turkey for the purpose, I suppose, of shooting virtue and goodness into the hearts and brains of the Turks, of interfering with their method of living, with their kind of government, with their freedom. While I abominate the unspeakable Turk, I admit he has the right, so long as he does not interfere with other people, to set up the kind of government he wants in Turkey, just the same as we have the right to set up the kind of government we want in the United States. The imposition of our views and our methods of life upon him is no less repugnant to the principles of liberty than would be the imposition by him of his views and his civilization upon us.

Again, beyond any question, if we enter this witches' caldron, we shall be involved in the great eastern question; involved to an extent no human brain dare undertake to measure and no prophet dare venture to foretell.

What of the questions between China and Japan? Are we now to draw a line and say, "Upon the nether side of this Japan shall stop, and upon the hither side China shall be permitted to hold sway"? Are we thus to become embroiled in the ambitions, the hopes, the race prejudices, and the religious conflicts of those peoples? If so, in what way and to what degree?

Every man with common sense now admits that no regulation, no rule, no act of ours will be effective unless it is backed either by actual force or by a potential force that can be called upon. Are we, then, to send our sons to slaughter in the contests of these two oriental peoples? Who gave us the right to judge their rights? Like us, they are the children of God. He created and placed them upon the earth. They were old before our Nation was born. They have remained reasonably satisfied for thousands upon thousands of years. Can we not let them alone?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I want to ask the Senator a question right at that point in relation to the remark which he has just made as to the enforcement of the dictates of the international tribunal by military force. The latest outgiving that I have been privileged to read concerning the proposal now being concocted abroad is that the use of military force to enforce these righteous international judgments is to be purely voluntary on the part of the constituent members of the league, which, of course, would conduce to harmonious action; and also the methods to be employed as coercive are to be economic in their nature; not any rude force. What does the Senator think about the efficiency of that?

Mr. REED. I will discuss that in a moment; but let me just finish the thought I was on.

The Japanese have been there in their island homes, living in a manner satisfactory to them, agreeable to their hearts' desire, for many thousand years. Their civilization probably antedates that of the oldest existing European nation. The Chinese, the original pacifists of the earth, gave to the world a literature, a wonderful poetry, and a marvelous philosophy thousands of years before the Christian era. Before Christ came upon the earth a Chinese philosopher had given mankind the Golden Rule reversed—"Do not unto others that which you would not have others do unto you." The Chinese people probably are living more happily to-day under their own form of government than they could possibly live if they had an American republican government imposed upon them. Why? Because their form of government springs from certain habits of living and ethical principles which are a part of the very nature of the Chinese. Our Government, which springs from our habits of thought and living, does not fit those principles, because their forms of thought, their very systems of logic and of mathematics, their reasoning, all their methods of life, are different from ours. Ours do not fit and will not fit the oriental.

The reason the Chinaman has the religion he has is because he is a Chinaman; the reason he has the family relations he has is because he is a Chinaman; the reason he believes in the philosophy that has been taught to him by Confucius and his other great philosophers is because he is a Chinaman. If you

were to remove him from the Orient to the Occident and force upon him our methods of life and government, he would immediately, upon being given his freedom, revert to his old habits, just as we would return to our old habits if we were given our freedom after being temporarily forced to adopt the habits and life of the Chinese.

It appears that we are to impose our Christian civilization, our peculiar type of civilization, to some extent upon these races and peoples. How far we do not know. If there is a revolution in China, are we to enter and become parties to it? Is this superstate, the government of which must be reposed in a few individual men of very limited intellect—for every man is a man of limited intellect, no matter how great he is; some of them do not know it, but God put limitations on all their brains—are these few men to set themselves up as the supermen of the world; are they to map out a course of conduct for all races, kindreds, and tongues?

That has been the old story of the ages. The Roman invaded other countries, and the Roman, better than any other nation on earth, unless it be England, knew how to invade countries and to leave their people reasonably content and prosperous. But Rome deemed it its business to force the Roman law, in a qualified sense, upon other countries, but only in a qualified sense. Then there came other nations not so wise, which undertook the work of conquest and endeavored to inculcate religion and morals with fagot, torch, and sword. They undertook to shoot their doctrines and laws into the quivering bodies of men and women who resisted to the death. They came over here from Spain and slaughtered the Aztecs of Mexico. They swept through the forests and mountains of South America, murdering in the name of the meek and lowly Jesus. But always while killing in the name of religion and civilization they were with greedy hands grabbing the gold of their victims.

If you ever set up a supnation it will be governed by somebody; it will either be some one great, dominant man who acts through the rest, or it will be the representatives of some one or two or three powerful nations who have combined to control. Human selfishness and greed will make themselves inevitably manifest. You will find them lurking in the twilight of the morning, conspiring in the midst of the day, and plotting in the stillness of the night.

Always with them there will come forth selfishness. The nations controlling the league will look out for themselves, and they will look out for themselves not as the common people or the common world or the ordinary nation, but they will look out for themselves as those who now possess the power, who have the international armies and the international courts.

Here is an illustration. It is, indeed, the fact that caused me to make these remarks: It appears that Great Britain, to whose rescue we came at the very moment when her marshal cried, "Our backs are to the wall. Britons, stand and die!"

It appears, I say, that Great Britain has no sooner extricated herself from the jaws of the German war monster than she proceeds selfishly to put up the bars of her trade against us.

Do I say this to arouse feeling against Great Britain? No. There is not a cleaner lot of sportsmen on this earth than the British; there is not a braver race of men than the British; there is not a more up-an-up, square-toed, hew-to-the-line class of men than the British; but these British are men with common sense, and when this war is over they are going to see to it that Great Britain is taken care of. If you set up a supnation you may be sure that Great Britain by herself, or in conjunction with other nations, will employ the powers of the league to her advantage and to the disadvantage of the rest of the world, and then will follow reprisal, and out of this thing organized for peace will come bloody war. This bed of peace will become a nest in which will be whelped litters of war dogs.

The way to keep men at peace is not to interfere with their rights; to let the ranchman have his ranch and keep his sheep, to let the owner keep his home, to let the merchant have his business, and not to interfere. When you seek to interfere you have fights. The way to have races live in peace is to let races alone and nations alone; let them run their own business; let them set up their own governments; let them manage their own affairs; let them keep within their own rights, and keep within your own, and then you will have some hope of peace. The moment interference begins, trouble starts.

If an independent nation wants to set up an embargo against the shipment of goods across its borders, well and good; other independent nations can, if they desire, get angry about it. It is like the high tariff and the low tariff, or free trade and protective tariff—it makes little difference. But I hope this embargo England has just laid against us will be a warning to those of you who have been walking with your heads in the stars, those of you who have been singing psalms to universal goodness and

uttering praises to the sweetness and godlike qualities of your own and everybody else's soul. Those of you who have been saying "the world has become too good to be selfish" remember that before the echoes along the Rhine front have died away, before we can get our troops back to our shore, Great Britain, that you went yonder to save, is proceeding to gain every advantage she can. Where she admits your soldiers to save her she will not admit your goods that you would like to sell her for honest money, giving honest value.

Let us wake up. If we do not wake up now, if the dreamers dream on, and if extensive propaganda is carried on, dreaming on and preaching on and talking on about eternal peace and happiness, our people may be led to the point where this Nation will be obliged to extricate itself from a circle of intrigue, surrounded by a circle of steel and of fire formed by our enemies while we sleep.

Ah, Mr. President, let America take care of herself. She had to fight for that privilege in the first place—the right to take care of herself. It was thinking of that that Washington crossed the Delaware; the fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence; it was thinking of that the patriots froze and starved and died; it was thinking of that Jackson fought at New Orleans. It was to gain and keep national sovereignty and individual liberty. It was to gain and keep the right of self-determination; to make that right so inviolable that no power on earth could affect it; to have a sovereignty so complete that there was nothing above it save God and nothing to direct it but the votes of the American people.

The wicked purpose of this hour—wicked, though it be not so intended—is in part to destroy that sovereignty and yield it back to European monarchs or to European powers from which our fathers originally fled and to gain their complete liberty from which they afterwards fought and died. Who thinks that England will not levy an embargo every time it is to her interest is mistaken. Who does not know that England is busy in every shipyard, creating a vast fleet of vessels to capture the trade of the world, knows nothing. Who does not know that English financiers have already laid their plans to control not only the commerce but the business of the world, as far as they can, knows nothing. Who does not know that in the marts of trade France will meet us as far as she is able, and that competition for existence, for life, will be keenly waged, knows nothing. In that competition I want to see America independent, untrammelled by any ties save those of respect and good will toward all. I want to see this country made so great that she can maintain her place as big brother to the Western Hemisphere, so that she can exercise a beneficent influence upon all of the South American countries; so that she can keep Mexico decent, and, if she does not remain decent, make her to be decent; so that our lines of trade may extend into these undeveloped lands; so that our fleets, the shuttles of the sea, shall constantly stretch the threads of trade and commerce between the United States and South American countries, weaving them into a web of amity and good will that shall last through the centuries. Thus we shall build here a vast empire over which the influence of America will be dominant. Let it always be an influence of love and of respect. If we are to accomplish this sublime mission, we can not yield the Monroe doctrine.

It is idle to claim that we can interfere with the policy of China and Japan away yonder, and at the same time undertake to deny to them the right to say what shall happen on this side of the sea. Where we take, we must give. Where they yield, we must also yield, unless, indeed, we are to do that monstrous thing, viz, set up a tyranny of four or five nations over all the world, and thus crush and destroy the liberties that men have established and maintained.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. It is not to ask a question; but, if the Senator will permit me, I am reminded by what he has been saying of some lines that were written by a great English poet in 1806, when Napoleon had Europe at his feet; and they came into my mind because they so well illustrated what the Senator has been saying. I will read only the last part of the sonnet.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LODGE. It was when England was left alone, confronting Napoleon:

'Tis well! from this day forward we shall know
That in ourselves our safety must be sought;
That by our own right hands it must be wrought;
That we must stand unproped, or be laid low.
O dastard whom such foretaste does not cheer!
We shall exult, if they who rule the land
Be men who hold its many blessings dear,
Wise, upright, valiant; not a servile band,
Who are to judge of danger which they fear,
And honor which they do not understand.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I think it illustrates one of the reasons of England's success in the world.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator, Mr. President.

I have but a word to say in conclusion, for I did not intend to take the floor this morning. Physically I am not fit to occupy the floor.

There are under arms to-day in the world, according to the best figures I am able to get, still approximately 15,000,000 men. One million eight hundred thousand of these are our own troops in Europe, and approximately 800,000 in camps in America. I have the accurate figures in my desk, but not with me. England has over 3,000,000 men still in the field and, according to the figures given me by a reliable source, Germany has in substance and effect over 2,500,000 men still in the field. This enormous aggregate of men, which, for round numbers, I will call 15,000,000, are being held in the field awaiting the making of peace.

I do not know what a soldier in Europe is worth economically, but I believe that an American soldier draws on the average approximately \$40 a month in wages, and I am very sure he can not be supported and supplied in France for \$40 a month more.

Mr. KING. It costs \$2,000 per annum per soldier.

Mr. REED. I am just told by the Senator from Utah that it costs \$2,000 per soldier per annum. While those soldiers are away that enormous expense is going on.

But there is another side of the question even more unfortunate. While they are in the camp and the field they are not in the workshop; they are not on the farm; they are not in the countinghouse. They are not producing. Every one of them, speaking broadly, if he were home, would be producing an amount fully equal to his present consumption; and that economic loss falls upon the country and falls upon the world in addition to the outgo of which I have just spoken. What is true of America is true of the armies of the rest of the world to a greater or less extent.

What, now, is the situation? We all know that Europe is starving. We have been asked to contribute and have contributed \$100,000,000 to be distributed in alms. While we are contributing to keep Europe from starving, Europe is expending countless millions of dollars, probably not less than \$100,000,000 a day, in loss of money and in loss of labor on the armies of Europe. My calculations are being made now in my mind as I go along, but I think they are sufficiently accurate. Furthermore, as suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], while they are clamoring for our money they are also clamoring for our food, and we are told that the American citizen can not have cheap food because it is necessary to send such large quantities of food abroad. Yet being withheld from the farm, from the workshop, from the place of production, are approximately thirteen and a half million European soldiers. What are they awaiting? Awaiting peace. An economic loss of not less than \$100,000,000 every day—perhaps that figure is ridiculously low—and all awaiting peace. And what is peace awaiting? Peace is awaiting, not the settlement of the dispute between Germany and France and England and Italy and the United States; peace is awaiting the realization and development of glorious dreams that have to do with South Africa, with the farthest islands of the sea, with the remotest quarters of the globe, and that do not have to do with the conditions of this war, but have to do with a reorganization and a regeneration of mankind that can not be accomplished in 10,000 years from this date.

Before you can make a Hottentot understand the Constitution of the United States, and believe in the Christian religion, and in the other things that white men believe in, you have got to give God Almighty a chance to change the shape of his skull and the convolutions of his brain. While we are waiting, this expense goes on, this starvation goes on, these vast armies are held in camp and field. American boys are kept away from their mothers' embraces; and if you do not think they are heart hungry I hope you will get some such letters as I have received.

I recently read a letter from an American colonel, a man intellectually great enough to sit in this Chamber—yes, great enough, even, to occupy a position in the Cabinet. [Laughter.] He got himself ready to go into this war before the war began, because he saw it coming. He went in the first day. He is in there yet. He is as game as they make them anywhere, as uncomplaining and as gallant as American boys can grow; and that is simply saying, as good as God has ever made. He wrote me and said: "If anybody thinks that the American soldier wants to be kept over here in France while the destiny of the South Sea Islands is being settled, or a new scheme of civilization worked out, he has another guess coming to him. We want this war over. We

want these Germans to pay the debts that they ought to pay. We want to come home and go to work. We want to see our mothers and our sisters, and some who have wives want to see their wives; and you had better get us home."

It was not the word of a petulant boy. He said: "Moreover, our Army is enduring more hardships to-day, in many respects, than it did during the war, for in many places the equipment has been so thoroughly taken away from us that we find it difficult at times to get up our supplies; and we are sitting here through these winter months waiting on what?" And he inclosed a clipping from an American newspaper in which it appeared that some duke or grand duke or some other thing of that kind—I never can keep track of them—who had been dethroned or toppled out of his place some years ago, was hovering about the peace conference and asking to have restitution made of his money lost some years before in some European brawl, and he said: "It is actually said in the newspapers, as a reason for halting the whole peace proceedings while his case is being considered, that this poor aristocrat actually has to work for his living!"

Mr. President, the thing to do is to settle our difficulties with Germany and Austria, impose the conditions of peace, and get American soldiers home; and then, in the name of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln and common sense, having gotten them home, let us keep them home.

Of course, there is much that can be done that would be of value in preventing international disputes and wars—we all know that—but not in the way they are going at it. If we were to settle our difficulties with Germany and Austria, and at the same time we were to assist in setting up certain new countries that really are strong enough to maintain their liberties, provided they are given a little initial help, that is all right. I do not complain, although this business of setting up governments is a good deal like matchmaking. It generally turns out badly. Speaking by and large the only people who are worthy of a government or who can maintain a government are the people that are brave enough to set it up in the first instance. Such is the history of the world.

Mr. President, I am admonished that the time for a vote is nearly up, that the morning hour is about to expire; and if it is necessary to have a vote, I shall discontinue my remarks, though I wanted to speak about two minutes more.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senator that the resolution will not be passed between now and the hour of 2 o'clock. I have several amendments to offer and perhaps an observation to make.

Mr. REED. Very well; then I will be permitted, just briefly, to finish.

Mr. President, no nation ever yet has been picked up from the ground, where its people lay prostrate, and put on its feet that was ever able to stand.

I was saying, Mr. President, when I paused in order to give an opportunity for these proceedings to take place, that no nation or race has ever been picked from the ground and put on its feet by another nation or race and made great and self-sustaining. Where has it happened in all history? It has been attempted time and again, and a sort of a temporary government put up, but always under a protectorate, a government in fact that is a mere puppet government. What great, virile, strong, splendid government ever developed from a thing like that? It is stillborn; it is handmade. It does not possess the vital principles that must be found in a nation that is to continue. What are those principles? The love of liberty must burn in the hearts of men who are oppressed until its flames can no longer be endured, and until they are willing to die a thousand deaths to gain and keep their liberty.

When that spirit thrills their souls and burns their breasts they rise and strike and gain freedom. Such races and such men are the only ones of any account or that ever will be of any account on this earth. I, of course, except a conquered people who have been overthrown by overwhelming power and who find the conqueror has put its foot on their neck and deprived them of any chance to rise. But even in such case in the course of the ages it almost invariably transpires that a brave race will throw off the conqueror's yoke.

Mr. President, instead of staying in Europe to make Europe over, instead of staying in Europe to make Asia over, instead of staying in Europe to make Africa over, instead of staying in Europe to resurvey and provide a new government for all the archipelagos of all the oceans the thing to do is to settle our disputes with Germany—of course, honorably and in connection with our allies—bring our armies home, and let our soldier boys feel once more the kisses of mothers on their cheeks, the embraces of wives and sisters, the thrill of American air, the glory

of free American institutions. Let them go back to the great processes of creation and of recreation.

Mr. President, I remark in conclusion, strike the cobwebs of fancy from your brain, oh ye leaders of men. Turn your eyes from the golden clouds to the practical fields of life. Remember that men are men and women are women, and that men and women have always been largely guided by what they conceive to be in their own interest. Remember that as people are so are nations. Be not therefore surprised, be not therefore chagrined, if Great Britain, holding a smoking rifle in one hand, with which she has been defending herself and ourselves in common battle, shall turn with the other hand and snatch from us trade advantages and the command of the seas. Be not surprised at that. It is old Adam working still in the garden of the world, where he will work as long as man shall be man.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not care to interfere with the Senator from New Jersey, but I had announced that I expected to call up Senate resolution No. 415 at the close of the morning business to-day. What has transpired since, it is not necessary for me to go into; but I shall call up that resolution at the earliest possible moment when I shall find it practicable to do so.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Before that suggestion is made, allow me to ask what the Senator from Ohio said. We could not hear him on this side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Ohio is asked to repeat his statement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I could not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. POMERENE. I said that I had expected to call up Senate resolution No. 415 this morning at the close of the morning business; that I was not able to do so because of what had occurred in the Senate; and that I would call it up at the earliest moment practicable.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the subject of the resolution? I do not know it by number.

Mr. POMERENE. The Michigan contest.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, the Michigan senatorial contest?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I rise to a point of order. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Harding	McNary	Spencer
Borah	Henderson	Moses	Sterling
Brandegee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Thomas
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Thompson
Culberson	Kellogg	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Kendrick	Pittman	Trammell
Curtis	Kenyon	Pomerene	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Reed	Wadsworth
Fernald	Knox	Saulsbury	Walsh
Fletcher	La Follette	Shafroth	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Sheppard	Watson
Gerry	Lodge	Sherman	Wolcott
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, S. C.	
Hale	McLean	Smoot	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] is absent on official business.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] on committee service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, some days ago the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], by request, introduced a bill (S. 5278) which confers upon the President blanket authority to appoint to the Regular Army certain generals and lieutenant generals who have held such rank during the present emergency.

I do not know what action the Military Affairs Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, will take on this bill.

The inspiration and suggestion for this legislation evidently come from the War Department—presumably from the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff. I am reliably informed, Mr. President, that the proposed beneficiaries of this bill are Gens. Pershing, March, Bliss, Liggett, and Bullard.

In view of the importance of the subject and its relation to certain other dominating questions, chiefly the promotion of soldiers of lesser rank than those mentioned, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments while I make some observations in connection with this proposed legislation, upon promotions in general, and upon the treatment accorded minor officers and privates as well, who have rendered splendid service in their country's behalf, but whose interests seem to be entirely lost sight of in the chaos which at present prevails.

First, Mr. President, I wish to point out to the Senate the fact that in the entire history of our country the high rank of general has been only four times conferred, and in each instance for distinguished services and conspicuous gallantry in actual warfare.

To Washington, to Grant, to Sherman, and finally to Sheridan, and to no others, was this supreme distinction granted. In the case of Washington, the rank was fixed by direct vote of the Continental Congress, in 1775, at the beginning of the Revolution. After his retirement from the Presidency, when war with France threatened, in 1798 and 1799, he was placed at the head of the Army, but was given the rank of lieutenant general.

By special act of Congress in 1866 the grades of general and lieutenant general were recreated for the sole benefit of Grant and Sherman, and they were duly nominated and were confirmed by the Senate. By reason of Grant's elevation to the Presidency, the office of general was vacated, and he nominated Sherman as his successor. This was in 1869.

The rank of general being meanwhile dormant, Congress in 1888 created it anew in order that Sheridan, then lieutenant general, might be given the higher honor while he still lived, for he was then upon his deathbed. Congress has never held the honor cheaply, and has always preserved the right to confer it by special act, whereby the granting of it has been attended by all the solemnity incident to direct congressional authority.

It will be observed that, except in the case of Washington, this high honor was not conferred during hostilities nor immediately following the close thereof. As a rule, Congress has acted only after a sufficient lapse of time to permit the exercise of a calm and deliberate judgment, preceded by adequate inquiry and uninfluenced by public clamor.

I do not maintain that these officers should not thus be honored eventually, but I do assert that there are other promotions which should first be made in justice to the men who, for conspicuous and distinguished gallantry and service, have been recommended by their superiors for such promotion, which, however, has been denied by the very officials who now propose this legislation. In common justice they should receive that promotion before we confer higher and more permanent honors upon the officers I have mentioned.

Furthermore, the promotions embodied in this bill should not be made until we get a better perspective of the administration of our Army and the treatment by those in high command of its officers and men.

So far as Gen. Pershing is concerned, I am ready at any time to acquiesce in and agree to the bestowal of such distinction as a grateful country may deem him worthy of; but even in his case it may be best to await the complete fruition of his campaign abroad, that we may the more fully measure the scope of his achievements.

In a war of this character, our total unpreparedness compelling us to feverishly assemble an army of 4,000,000 men, it is not to be wondered at that grave injustices, blunders, and even scandals were developed. Some errors of judgment were inevitable, and must be treated with proper leniency, though it would be a fatal mistake to ignore them entirely.

No more splendid army, mentally, morally, and physically, ever marched to martial music than these 4,000,000 American freemen.

The placing of 2,000,000 of these magnificent soldiers on the fighting line in France, with only an inconceivably small loss, was an undertaking which makes the heart of every American patriot beat with justifiable pride.

The heroic achievements of that Army have added new luster to the pages of American history, already luminous with the magnificent deeds at Trenton, Princeton, Monmouth, Saratoga, Yorktown, New Orleans, Antietam, Gettysburg, and Appomattox. The

traditional valor of the American soldier was splendidly exhibited at Belleau Wood, Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel, the Argonne Forest, Verdun, the Meuse, Sedan, and the Hindenburg line.

In these great battles, waged on the fair soil of France for the same principles of civil liberty for which their forefathers had fought, the men in khaki have kept alive the glorious traditions of American determination and bravery. We want no cloud of scandal or injustice to dim the glory of America's part in the supreme conflict for democracy. We should be generous in rewarding the services of officers and men alike, but our action should be based upon complete justice to all, and our conclusions should be arrived at only after the full records of service are placed before us.

There are many things which are not clear, and Congress should demand an adequate explanation before bestowing military honors. Many things have been done that seem unjust, yet they may be promptly explained. Criticism, however, is widespread, and grave injustices, owing to faulty administration, are being daily brought to the attention of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Serious charges come to us in every mail from parents and returning soldiers—stories that the cables have never told us, that the papers have never published, and our officials have never revealed. These allegations will not down, and it is our duty, in justice to our constituents and to our consciences alike, to sift them to the bottom and withhold honors from those higher up until these matters are explained to our satisfaction.

We have heard much during this war about "dollar-a-year men," "swivel-chair officers," "bomb-proof jobs," and so forth, in Washington and elsewhere. I do not altogether sympathize with or endorse these views. Undoubtedly there were such individuals in Washington, "slackers" in every sense of the word, yet I believe many of these men—most of them, perhaps—were patriotically doing imperatively important work back of the line and are deserving of the thanks of their countrymen for their services.

But there is a grave suspicion that there was studied favoritism shown by those in authority; that military politics was rife; that many officers of the National Guard and the National Army were discriminated against; and that Regular Army men were favored.

There is every reason, too, for the belief that promotions in America were more rapid, more the result of influence, than at the battle front. I do not suggest that these promotions at home were improper, but that promotions in France were tardy by comparison.

At an early stage of the war there was undue haste in according honors to leading officers, and for this the Senate was in part responsible.

The preliminary investigations made by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in December, 1917, seemed to demonstrate unmistakably that three chiefs of bureaus had each failed as an effective administrator of his bureau, yet all of these were advanced to the grade of major general for the emergency, two of them being subsequently given permanent rank as major general of the line, reaping a high reward, and for what?

These officers had seen long service with honorable careers. Future investigation may absolve them from blame, but while the weight of criticism rested on them they were promoted.

On the other hand, let us look at Enoch H. Crowder, whom this Nation and the civilized nations of the earth generally should ever hold in grateful remembrance for the extraordinary celerity with which he mobilized America's great citizen army, that saved the world from autocracy's fatal grip.

He has with equal ability filled the dual rôle of Judge Advocate General and Provost Marshal General, and has received the reward only which was accorded all other chiefs of bureaus. If, however, he shall not be reappointed by the President when his term is completed, February 15, 1919, he will be relegated to civil life, with his rank taken away from him, or will take his place by reappointment as colonel in his own department.

Is that a just and proper distribution of military honors?

And let us not forget that last year when it was proposed by Congress to grant the rank of lieutenant general to Gen. Crowder, he immediately declined the suggested honor, for the reason that he did not desire to be singled out for special honors when the selective-service boards under him were working without hope of reward.

And what of Henry P. McCain, who for the first year and a half of the war as Adjutant General rendered extraordinarily efficient service in shaping the Army handed over to him by Gen. Crowder? For reasons which have never been divulged, he seems to have been summarily removed from his post some months ago, and, though he continues to hold by new appointment the rank of major general during the emergency, he reverts to the rank of colonel when the war shall end.

Again I ask, is that a just and proper distribution of military honors?

On the one hand, two officers who did not succeed have been made major generals for life, while two other distinguished officers who did not fail find themselves adrift or holding minor rank when the war is over. Why does not this bill, inspired by the War Department, provide proper recognition for Gens. Crowder and McCain?

There have been certain grave mistakes and blunders during the present war, mistakes and blunders which will never be forgotten, because the reason for their existence has never been explained, and the responsibility for them must be placed upon those who determined the policy of the War Department. Surely until they are explained those who may be responsible for these mistakes and blunders should not be further honored.

Of course, the Secretary of War must assume responsibility for all the shortcomings and derelictions of those who are his subordinates. On the other hand, during the progress of this war the Chief of Staff has been vested with or has assumed extraordinary, almost autocratic powers, such as no other American military officer has ever been endowed with in the history of the Republic. From day to day he took to himself greater authority, until he was almost supreme, almost a law unto himself.

Under the circumstances the Chief of Staff must expect to be held responsible in a large measure for every phase of development of the Military Establishment and to have charged against him the delinquencies of his subordinates.

Throughout the entire war, until the signing of the armistice, November 11, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs exhibited the fatal weaknesses of the War Department program—inexcusable delay, unspeakable inefficiency, incredible extravagance. Such was the record unfolded from day to day.

As a result of the disclosures developed by that committee, many improvements in organization were inaugurated by the Secretary of War, and a greater degree of efficiency was manifest as the months passed by. But, as a rule, these changes were made too late to greatly affect the equipment of our forces on the fighting line, and, because of this delay, grave were the disasters which ensued.

I shall not dwell upon these pitiful details. Yet I would remind this Senate that, even up to the day hostilities ceased, in spite of the billion dollars we expended for aircraft, not an American-built battle plane or bombing plane was used by our Army in France. Except for the foreign-built planes, we had none at our disposal, except De Havilland fours, which were little more than armed reconnaissance planes.

Let us not forget what Gen. Pershing has informed us on this point. After dwelling upon the absolute lack of guns of heavy caliber, he reported:

In aviation we were in the same situation. We obtained from the French the necessary planes for training our personnel, and they have provided us with a total of 2,676 pursuit, observation, and bombing planes. * * * As to tanks, we were also compelled to rely upon the French. Here, however, we were less fortunate, for the reason that the French production could barely meet the requirements of their own armies.

For weeks the German planes flew over our forces almost at will, without adequate opposition from our own aviators, hundreds of our men being the victims of Hun mastery of the air at those points.

Who was responsible for that lamentable state of affairs? Has this Senate forgotten the report of the President's own investigator, the Hon. Charles E. Hughes? Two Army officers were recommended for punishment, while the disciplining of another, Col. Deeds, was suggested.

What was the result? The President felt constrained to pardon the two officers in advance of trial, while Col. Deeds was "vindicated," so it was called, by the Secretary of War.

Whoever was responsible, directly or indirectly, for the tragedy of the aircraft fiasco, which resulted so disastrously to our brave troops in the field, should have been tried and, if found guilty, have been compelled to suffer the maximum penalty under the law, military or civil. That is the kind of "vindication" he or they should have received, not a certificate of character from the President or the War Department.

Furthermore, in spite of billions of dollars appropriated for ordnance, there was not a single American-built heavy gun at the front, except about a dozen 8-inch, and a few turned over to the Army by the Navy. What wonder is it that our boys were slaughtered like sheep in the Argonne Forest!

Upon this point I refer you to the recent speech of Gov. Allen, of Kansas, who has lately returned from the front, where he spent nearly a year. This scathing arraignment of those responsible for the carnage in the Argonne Forest, due to lack of artillery, has never been answered because it is unanswerable. It is a sanguinary page in our military history.

Concerning this matter, moreover, Gen. Pershing has reported as follows:

Our entry in the war found us with few of the auxiliaries necessary for its conduct in the modern sense. Among our most important deficiencies in material were artillery, aviation, and tanks. We accepted the offer of the French Government to provide us with the necessary artillery equipment of 75s, 155-millimeter howitzers, and 155 G. P. E. guns from their own factories for 30 divisions. There were no guns of the calibers mentioned manufactured in America on our front the date the armistice was signed. The only guns of these types produced at home thus far received in France are 109 75-millimeter guns.

Who is responsible for that wretched state of affairs—for that slaughter of the innocents in the Argonne Forest and elsewhere? The dead can not speak. Let us demand that the living shall make answer.

But I will not dwell upon these phases of the war. There is so much to be said regarding the lamentable failures of the War Department concerning almost every phase of the great struggle, and these will be touched upon at length upon some future occasion.

I now propose to comment briefly upon the order of the War Department issued November 12, 1918, the day after the armistice was signed, that no further promotions should take place, and that no more commissions should be issued.

That famous order has never been published, I believe. Here is a copy of it, supplemented by The Adjutant General's cablegram to Gen. Pershing:

Memorandum for The Adjutant General.

Subject: Suspension of recommendations for emergency promotion and appointment.

The Secretary of War directs that telegraphic orders issue to commanding officers of all tactical divisions in the United States, to commanding generals of all territorial departments, replacements, central officers' training schools, camp headquarters, depot brigades, ports of embarkation, and the commanding officers of all other units of independent command within the limits of the United States, the commanding general Philippines Department, and the commanding general Panama Canal Department in substance as follows:

Recommendations for emergency appointment and promotion under the provisions of G. O. No. 78 c. s. W. D. are suspended until further notice.

HENRY JERVEY,

Major General, General Staff, Assistant to the
Chief of Staff, Director of Operations.

PERSHING.

Amesforce, Paris.

(C. of S.) No. 2191, November 14. Confidential.

War Department has adopted as a policy not to appoint or promote any further officers in the United States Army for the period of the emergency. This policy to be effective November 11, 1918.

MARCH.
HARRIS.

Some weeks since I wrote the Secretary of War, as follows, regarding that order:

The summary order putting an end to all promotions was of so drastic a nature that it has worked a hardship, an injustice, indeed, in innumerable cases. I trust you may conclude to set that order aside, to the end that promotions earned in actual service may be effected.

The Secretary made reply, as follows:

There is an evident misunderstanding as to the cause for the suspension of promotions in the Army after the conclusion of the armistice. Appointment to a military office, as to any other office, may properly be made only when a vacancy exists. Appointments and promotions were made throughout the war to fill vacancies as they occurred. As you know, demobilization of the Army was begun immediately after the conclusion of the armistice, and from that time, instead of there being any vacancies, we had a surplus of officers in all grades, which it was necessary to reduce by discharge. If additional appointments were made to any grade, there would be no proper employment for the appointee.

As for the suggestion which is sometimes offered that the appointments might be made but the appointee immediately discharged, I think this comes from a misconception of the nature of a military force. It is apparently thought of in the same way as a medal or decoration. It would be difficult to justify the appointment of any person, civil or military, when there is no expectation or intention that he shall perform any duties under the appointment.

For the reasons I have given, no appointments or promotions are being made for the purpose of active service. There can be no objection, however, to appointment to an office to which no present duties are attached, but which, nevertheless, has an actual legal existence. Immediately after the armistice, therefore, I directed that a commission in the Officers' Reserve Corps, with inactive status, be offered to every officer and enlisted man who had duly qualified for appointment. A lieutenant who was recommended for promotion to a captaincy can not receive such a promotion in active service, since we already have more captains than we can employ and are discharging many daily. This man, however, does receive a reserve commission as captain.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey state who is the writer of that letter?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I stated that I had written to the Secretary of War, and that the Secretary of War had made reply, as follows.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know how many officers have been offered and have received places in the Reserve Corps?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know of any?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think I know of one only.

This statement of the Secretary of War is quite clear, and we should be grateful to him for presenting his views so frankly. Yet, I did not agree with him. There has been no measure enacted by the Congress, so far as I am aware, which limits the commissions which the War Department may issue except in the Regular Army. Certain it is, prior to the armistice, such commissions were issued daily, and, to a very large extent, to those who never left the shores of America.

When hostilities ceased there had accumulated a large number of recommendations for promotion, and the commissions were all ready for the signatures of the appropriate officers. I understand that included in this list were thousands of the very flower of our Army in France, lieutenants, captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, colonels, and brigadier generals, who won imperishable laurels at Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel, the Argonne, Sedan, and so forth, but who were refused promotion under the drastic order of the Secretary of War.

I do not think this course was acceptable to the American people. It is my belief that they would gladly sanction such increased expenditure as might be involved, even though the total should reach \$100,000,000, the amount we have appropriated, at the President's demand, for the purpose of feeding Europe's unemployed.

Furthermore, if in order to find places for some of these heroes of the bloody battle fields of France it should be necessary to make vacancies, let the Secretary of War get rid of 10,000 or more of the officers filling executive and clerical posts in Washington and elsewhere in America and supplant them with the battle-scarred veterans of Chateau-Thierry and the Argonne Forest.

The Secretary of War has recently seen a great light and has found it possible to reverse himself, at least partially. Under date of January 30 a cablegram has been sent to Gen. Pershing authorizing him to "make such promotions among officers of the line up to and including the grade of colonel as will give the officers who, in his judgment, deserve it rank equal to the command exercised by them."

It is but natural that we should ask why, in view of this latter conclusion, it was necessary to issue the order of November 12, which caused such a vast measure of disappointment to thousands of brilliant young officers on the fighting line in France, and why the Secretary felt called upon to indicate, as he did in his letter to me, already quoted, that further promotions were not practicable.

As a matter of fact, the reversal of the order suspending all promotions does not meet the situation and in some respects is worse than the original order. Better no promotions than the selection of a favored few.

I know the Secretary entertains rather curious views on the question of promotions. Only recently he stated to me that a promotion was not a reward for services performed, but a recognition of the need of an officer to fill a higher rank, and was granted solely because the officer was capable of performing the service in that rank. I can not entirely agree to that. Our whole military history contradicts it. Promotions come in recognition of experience, fitness, and courage in the lower grades, and you can not gainsay it.

Thousands of young officers have been recommended for promotion for conspicuous gallantry in action or efficient service rendered elsewhere. I claim that every worthy recommendation by superior officers of those who have served in the battle line should be approved and the advancements effected.

This partial remedy of the Secretary of War is unfair and unequal, and will exclude and relegate to private life unnumbered thousands of officers as much entitled to promotion as the comparatively small number who are likely to be benefited by the recent order to Gen. Pershing. Justice to all is my demand.

In this connection I wish to present an illustration of the Government's lack of adequate recognition for services rendered. Very early in the war about 1,000 young American doctors were commissioned as first lieutenants in the Medical Corps, were sent to the English Army and were scattered along the entire front line as surgeons, assigned to that army, whose medical force had become depleted.

They were a very superior class of men and they rendered splendid service. Ten or 15 gave their lives; 35 to 50 were wounded, yet, except in a few cases, no recognition of any sort has been given to these men, I am told, though no par-

ticipants in the war more fully deserved promotion. They have been forgotten.

Now, I wish more particularly to present some points bearing upon certain of the psychological aspects of soldier life, and especially the treatment of our boys while overseas and upon their retirement from the Army.

Who is responsible for the inexcusable failures to deliver letters to our soldiers in France? This dereliction we must not charge against the much-censured Post Office Department which already has innumerable sins to answer for. The War Department established its own postal force, or pretended to do so. What a fiasco resulted! I doubt if there is a single Member of this Senate who has not received letters from disheartened parents complaining of the failure to deliver letters to loved ones overseas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like in this connection, if it will not disturb the Senator from New Jersey, to call the attention of the Senate to a letter from a captain to a mother who had written him in regard to her son. The letter is as follows:

In reply to your letter dated October 3, 1918, would state that no word has been received at this station regarding your son.

2. The correspondence that has taken place regarding the above is becoming tiresome to this office. You were informed in our letter of August 17, 1918, that upon receipt of any word at this office you would be promptly furnished with the same for your information. With that assurance, and in view of the fact that the proper authorities have been notified to furnish a descriptive list of soldiers, it hardly seems necessary to constantly correspond regarding the same.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to this letter, because it was written by a captain to a mother who has not heard from her son since July last. She had written this officer in October and received this brutal answer. Mothers, fathers, wives, and relatives are entitled to receive courteous answers to letters about their dear ones whom they have given to their country.

I wish, as one, to join with the Senator from New Jersey in condemning such letters.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Kansas for his contribution to the RECORD. I have a number; in fact, many hundreds of similar letters. Let me quote from one of the hundreds of such communications I have received, from Ernest L. Smithers, Maplewood, N. J., who writes as follows, January 17, 1919:

I attach herewith three envelopes which contained letters written to my son, Eric F., who is with his brother, a Lieutenant in the Twenty-ninth Division, One hundred and fifteenth Infantry, American Expeditionary Forces in France. I may say that at least 25 letters sent to Eric by his mother, myself, and friends, written during the months of August, September, and October, have been returned to us, and they are still coming in. You will see the notation on the envelopes is "Sick. C. P. O. Directory Section."

The facts of the case are that my son was taken sick in August, 1918, and was in a hospital for two or three months, which was just the time when he needed his letters from home. We had been informed, like others, that it was vitally important to keep up the morale of the Army. With this point in mind, both Mrs. Smithers and myself and many of his friends forwarded letters regularly twice a week, only to have them returned, undelivered, and marked "Sick."

It certainly does seem like a great misfortune for letters to be returned in this manner, especially when a boy in the Army is taken sick and is in a hospital. Going through a period of this kind needs consolation, and the only consolation are his letters from his parents and friends at home.

My family is so distressed that letters written to our boy were handled in this way, and he was allowed to think that he had been entirely forgotten, that I feel it only right to bring this matter to your attention.

I feel constrained to cite another case from the hundreds which have been brought to my attention. R. Ireton, Camden, N. J., writes, January 23, 1919, as follows:

My son has received no mail of any kind for four months, although I am writing to him several times every week. Is there any excuse for this treatment? He received his last mail October 12, while in action at the front, with German shells falling all around him.

He was wounded October 21 and sent to a hospital at Blois, France, and since in a camp 12 kilometers from Le Mans, but has not had a piece of mail for four months now. Talk about German cruelty! Can you find much worse than wounded and sick men and their mail and pay kept away from them? He begs to know if we are living or dead with the "flu."

He has received no pay since July and we have not received any allotments since then, either. He can not even get the money we have sent him from home. He was wounded in August and received no mail for two months. He has not received his Christmas box, sent through the Red Cross. * * * Shouldn't they know that letters and a Christmas box from home are the most important things, next to life itself, to a wounded man thousands of miles away from home?

Here is a single paragraph from a communication from another constituent, Walter S. Smith, Jersey City, who inclosed

the envelope of a letter sent a son, Corpl. Edwin E. Smith, in France, which came back marked "Sick." The writer says:

It is not my purpose to annoy you with needless complaints, but I would be obliged if you would take a look at inclosed envelope, which tells a story of a letter of cheer denied a soldier boy because he unfortunately was ill, and said letter dragged 3,000 miles back to the sender.

Words are literally inadequate to describe one's emotions in reading such letters from the parents of the boys overseas. It is incredible that the sick and wounded soldiers of a great Nation should be the victims of such brutality!

It must not for a moment be thought that I am presenting only rare cases. My files exhibit hundreds of letters of the same tenor, and I have no doubt every Senator on this floor can say the same. In other words, the postal service of the Army in France was lamentably inefficient, and not the slightest effort seems to have been made to improve it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, without undertaking to fix the responsibility—although I hope with the Senator that the responsibility will be fixed at some time—let me say that I hold in my hand a postal order which was bought by me here in Washington on the 22d day of June, 1918, and forwarded to a little nephew, who was not quite 18, and who was sick in a hospital in France. It was sent to him because he had received no pay during his service in France. This postal order was sent to him at his address at the hospital which was known. His unit was given, his name was given, and there was no question but that he could be easily identified if only an effort was made to do so. He was killed in action on the 18th of July. This postal order was received by me about 10 days ago, returned in the same envelope in which I sent it, marked "Not known."

There was absolutely no excuse for anything of that kind. His mother received a letter from him some time the latter part of October saying that he had recovered from his illness in the hospital and rejoicing that he had joined his unit and was going to the battle front. A few days after that she received a telegram from the office of The Adjutant General that he had been killed in action on the 18th or possibly the 20th of July; and two or three weeks after that, after I had taken the matter up here to try to trace up the matter, the mother received another telegram from the office of The Adjutant General wanting to know where she had gotten the information that her son had been killed in action.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I think it will not be without interest for me to say that when the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration in committee, I asked some questions of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, under whose direction the Foreign Mail Service is conducted. In making some explanation about the responsibility for the poor service, he suggested that, as of course is known, the War Department was responsible for the service after the mail left the docks in this country. The next day some employees of the Post Office Department came to my office with a very considerable number of letters which had been mailed in this country more than six months before, and had gone to France. The envelopes were stamped "unknown," and the letters returned to this country about three months before they were brought to my office. I was informed by these postal employees that there were a large number of letters of that character in the office of The Adjutant General in Washington, which had been lying there for three months, with apparently no attempt to deliver them or return them to the writers.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, we all know that the postal service of the Army in France was lamentably inefficient, and not the slightest effort seems to have been made to improve it.

Can anything more grossly stupid or heartless be imagined? Though accurately addressed to the soldier, with the name and number of his unit plainly indicated, the envelopes are marked "Sick," and the letters, instead of following the poor soldier to the hospital, are shipped back to America unread, unopened, undelivered.

Who is responsible for the delay in the payment of the soldiers' compensation? If any official dare assert that there is

no such delay, let him come to my office and I will place my files at his disposal. There is such delay, prolonged delay in numerous cases, delay that is inexcusable. In one of the letters from which I have just quoted is the statement "he has received no pay since July," seven months ago.

Let me briefly cite another case, which not only illustrates the War Department's slipshod methods in this matter but in certain others to which I shall invite attention in these remarks. Writing from Prospect Plains, N. J., January 20, 1919, M. V. Landmann, speaking of a certain case, says:

Perhaps the records in this department are something like those of the Casualty Division of the War Department, where Miss Bagley (Mrs. Falconer's secretary) was assured late in December that as they had no record of Pvt. Willard Snedeker's being wounded, his wound, if any, must have been a slight one. As a matter of fact, he was so severely wounded in action October 3 that his leg was amputated above the knee October 4, but the parents have never received any notification. He arrived penniless but cheerful—not having been paid for many months—in New York January 5, and through the kindness of the Salvation Army was able to send a postal to his mother to let her know of his arrival.

A grateful country, indeed! This soldier, minus a leg, unpaid for many months for his services in France, returned to his native land without a penny in his pocket with which to purchase a postal card in order to notify his mother of his arrival. How do we expect to develop patriotism in the minds of our young men in the years to come in view of these things?

Another constituent of mine—Mrs. Robert Daly King, of East Orange, N. J.—writes me, January 17, 1919, as follows:

It has come to my actual knowledge that our soldiers are not receiving their pay, and I know of no way to remedy this disgraceful fact than to make known to those who represent us our displeasure at this condition, register our protest, and ask that justice be done. * * * The soldiers of France, to whom we give high praise, will not fight without pay. So with England, and doubtless with other lands; but our men give their lives with all bravery and never falter in their loyalty to their country, without a murmur of complaint at the rank injustice being done.

Another constituent of mine—Alfred V. C. Genung, jr., of East Orange, N. J.—writes me, January 23, 1919, to the following effect:

My son, Ralph C. Genung, private, of One hundred and twelfth Heavy Field Artillery, Battery C, Twenty-ninth Division, has been out of funds since October, borrowing right and left, we, in the meantime, endeavoring to get funds to him through the Guarantee Trust Co., of New York, all this due to his not being paid by the War Department. How long would civilians working for the Government go without funds as our sons have been forced to do? And Army rules force them to hold their tongues as to their properly due stipend, and that small, as you well know.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. With the permission of the Senator, I should like to read an extract from a letter from a soldier of the Third Trench Mortar Battalion, Ninth Division, Third Artillery:

Mother, I have been here for about seven months, and never have had a pay day yet, and we sure have been having a pretty tough time. It certainly looks like Uncle Sam has forgotten his boys in the trenches; but, oh, if he will carry me back to my dear mother he can have what he owes me.

I want to state in the same connection that the paper that prints this letter also prints an account of the death of this boy from pneumonia in France.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, we Americans talk much of our liberality to our soldiers. Does it ever occur to us to get their viewpoint? Visit their camps, and this is the pessimistic song you will hear, sung to the tune of "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah":

All we get is thirty dollars,
All we get is thirty dollars,
All we get is thirty dollars,
But we don't get a blank blank cent.

Fifteen dollars for allotment,
Fifteen dollars for allotment,
Fifteen dollars for allotment,
And we only have fifteen dollars left.

Seven dollars for insurance,
Seven dollars for insurance,
Seven dollars for insurance,
And we only have eight dollars left.

Five dollars for a liberty bond,
Five dollars for a liberty bond,
Five dollars for a liberty bond,
And we only have three dollars left.

Three dollars for the laundry,
Three dollars for the laundry,
Three dollars for the laundry,
And we don't get a blank blank cent.

All we do is sign the pay roll,
All we do is sign the pay roll,
All we do is sign the pay roll,
And we don't get a blank blank cent.

As a matter of fact, our soldiers are returning to civil life absolutely penniless and in many cases with back pay due them. Furthermore, they are wandering about the streets in complete ignorance as to where they shall make further insurance and liberty bond payments in case they should earn sufficient money for that purpose, but there is absolutely no one in authority to enlighten them and no one who seems to care a penny regarding their future in that respect.

Regarding this and similar matters, I understand Gen. Crowder, the Provost Marshal General, prepared a systematic plan whereby the various draft boards were to be clothed with jurisdiction in the premises, looking after the discharged soldiers, and furnishing them with aid and advice concerning their material welfare. This plan failed to receive the approval of the War Department, and now the soldiers to a large extent are at sea without chart or compass.

Never was there so much need of sympathy and care as at the present time, following the return of these boys to civil life. Gen. Crowder's plan was practical and would have prevented the unspeakable conditions that now exist.

The re-creation of these draft boards as Government agencies to meet and solve the soldiers' problems was an excellent proposition and would have restored normal conditions almost immediately, because the men would have come under the influence of the home atmosphere and their necessities would have been adequately appraised, understood, and adjusted.

But Gen. Crowder's proposals were, unfortunately, not adopted by the War Department.

We have provided 30 days' pay for the discharged soldiers, and the senior Senator from Arizona offered an amendment for 60 days' pay. This would have been very costly and would not have met the problem. The greater number of our soldiers do not want charity, particularly the men with jobs awaiting them. But the man out of employment wants to be helped until he gets on his feet, and meanwhile his family, if he has one, must be cared for.

Why not provide that these draft boards shall assist the men so situated to secure employment, supplying them and their families, if in actual need, with sufficient funds to sustain them for one, two, three, or even six months, until employment is obtained?

To return to the question of the ignorance of our soldiers concerning future payments on liberty bonds, and so forth, it is quite clear that under existing conditions such payments as have been made will, in many cases, be entirely lost to the soldiers, with the Government Treasury the gainer to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

In many cases, I understand, shrewd and unscrupulous speculators are hanging around the debarkation camps, buying up these bonds at greatly reduced figures, in effect, robbing our boys in khaki simply because they do not know in what direction to turn for advice and protection.

Who, Mr. President, is responsible for the gross delay in the payment of soldiers' allotments and allowances to mothers, wives, and other dependents? As unspeakably inefficient as the War Risk Insurance Bureau has been, much of the blame must rest upon the War Department.

As I understand the situation, the soldier's compulsory allotment is limited to \$15, which is under the control of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. If the soldier voluntarily makes an additional allotment, the Quartermaster Department handles the job—or mishandles it. Since last June, when the War Department stepped in to assume charge of this branch of the allotment proposition, to the great confusion of the whole system, there has been nothing but delay, delay, and yet more delay.

Again, let me suggest, if any official of either the War Risk Insurance Bureau or the War Department questions the existence of these appalling delays, let him visit my office and my files will be placed at his disposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no question in the world about the statements of the Senator on that subject until recently, but I think the present Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Col. Lindsley, has considerably improved the situation recently.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have observed no evidence of it. I still have the complaints coming in daily.

This whole question of procrastination on the part of the Government in the payment of allotments and allowances to suffering, starving mothers, wives, and children of soldiers constitutes the chief tragedy of the war, so far as America is concerned.

In this matter of the heartless conduct of the Government, let me quote a letter from a mother in my State, which, in simple language, speaks more eloquently than can I or any other Senator on this floor. Mrs. J. E. Romaine, Maywood, N. J., writes me as follows:

I am in receipt of a communication from the Treasury Department, Bureau of War Risk Insurance, stating that the allotment and allowance of my son made out to me, which was paid in full to me September 30 for \$25, had been overpaid by the Government, as he was killed on the 25th of September. The demand is made upon me to refund to the Treasury Department \$4.17.

I was not aware that the soldiers were employed by the Government by the day or hour. If you, dear Senator, were employing a man by the month and he was away sick or had died a few days before his month was up, would you deduct from his salary these few days? I, as poor as I am, would feel that I was in honor bound to pay this trivial \$4.17. Dear sir, what would you advise—return the \$4.17 or not?

What a picture of pathos! And, too, on the other hand, what an exhibition of brutal asininity on the part of the Government! Has it become such a Cheap John affair that it must wound the heartbroken mothers of the land in cases like this?

I shall not detain the Senate by quoting further from the hundreds of letters in my files, begging for aid in securing expeditious action upon allotment-and-allowance claims. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would not suffice to present even a small fraction of them.

Who is responsible for the delays in reporting casualties, and why should months elapse before relatives in this country are informed of the wounding, the illness, or the deaths of loved ones in France?

Is there a Senator on the floor who can not produce hundreds of letters from constituents conveying heart-rending complaints of this kind?

Let me cite a case which has almost a comical phase. A young constituent of mine was wounded in France some months ago, lay in a hospital for weeks, recovered sufficiently to be sent to America, and reached his home in Jersey City. Here, after a time, upon answering a ring of the door bell, he was handed a telegram from the War Department, advising his mother that he had been wounded—an event which had taken place early in the fall.

Here is a typical letter, Mr. President; and if any Senator can listen to the reading of it without the blush of shame mantling his cheeks, then must he possess a heart of adamant. Martin J. Higgins, a member of the staff of the Sunday Call, Newark, writes me as follows:

There is a widow who has been in my election district—a Mrs. Ellen Sissons, 14 North Third Street, Newark—whose son, Pvt. George A. Sissons, Company L, Twenty-third United States Infantry, died as the result of wounds received in action on July 29, 1918. His mother was not notified of his death until New Year's Day. The soldier in his last letter to her informed her he had made out an allotment and had insured himself, making her the beneficiary.

This poor woman has never received a penny from the Government, and she is greatly in need. She is proud of the fact that she was honored by giving her only son for the cause of humanity, but thinks the Government is neglectful in not doing its part by sending her what is rightly hers—the allotment and insurance. It is nearly six months since the soldier died, and yet on January 4, 1919, the War Risk Bureau informed her that as far as they knew her son was alive and well, at the same time advising her to communicate with the War Department for "further information."

In the colloquial language of the street, can you beat it? This broken-hearted mother, after being kept in the dark six months concerning the fate of her only son, is finally, January 1, 1919, advised by the War Department that he died last summer, meanwhile allowing her to suffer for lack of the necessities of life. Three days later the War Risk Bureau advises her that it knows nothing of the fate of her boy, and turns her over to the tender (?) mercies of the War Department.

Can such things be and overcome us like a summer cloud
Without our special wonder?

Multiply these cases by 50,000 and you can form some idea of the magnitude of the Government's dereliction in this matter, of vital concern to a vast army of patriotic yet sorrowing mothers, wives, and sisters in America.

Who is responsible for the total lack of adequate sanitary hospital facilities for our wounded and invalid soldiers who have recently been brought over, and who are largely distributed in various improvised hospitals, so called, throughout the country?

Why did not the War Department make adequate provision for the awful yet inevitable contingency? Did they expect this to be a bloodless war, a war of words only, a war of diplomatic "notes"? Did they expect the pen to prove mightier than the sword and that the President's brilliant fulminations of rhetoric and syntax would put the Huns hors du combat without the loss of life or the shedding of blood?

Fatal hope! Almost as fatal as the expectation that through the agency of a league of nations all future wars will be prevented.

While upon this unpleasant theme, let me ask, Why did not the War Department or other Government agency make some serious effort or take proper precautions to keep the influenza epidemic from our shores and from our camps last fall, the result being the death of tens of thousands of splendid young Americans, who deserved a better fate?

And who was responsible for the incredible neglect to provide proper hospital facilities to meet such contingencies? I shall not dwell in detail upon the horrors of that distressing period, but I can not refrain from mentioning a single incident.

One of my constituents died of the epidemic at Camp Humphreys, just below Washington. His body having been withheld from his relatives for nearly a week, I inquired the cause. The camp commander referred me to a near-by undertaker. The latter casually informed me that he had held the body until he could accumulate a carload for shipment, and a few hours previously he had shipped north 178 bodies.

Who is responsible for this lamentable state of affairs? Surely there can be no doubt upon that point. The same fatal policy of procrastination and unpreparedness characterizing every phase of the war, in its relation to the living, has been employed in dealing with the sick, wounded, dying, and dead. No such chapter of inexcusable neglect and inefficiency can be found in the pages of this or any other civilized nation's history.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the splendid speech of the Senator in dealing with these matters; but I can not help but wonder at the Senator's vote the other day in favor of turning over to this very department the settlement of two billion seven hundred millions of contracts. It seems to me that if this department is of the kind that the Senator describes, surely the Government ought not to turn over to it the right to settle these contracts, amounting to \$2,700,000,000.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I quite appreciate that the Senator has asked the question in order to embarrass me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all; quite to the contrary. I asked the question for this purpose, if the Senator will yield to me: I am intensely interested in seeing that every contractor in this country shall get every dollar to which he is entitled, but at the same time I am intensely interested in seeing that the Government's interests shall be protected in settling with contractors; and I believe that the Senator made a mistake in voting to turn over to this department, which he declares to be inefficient, the absolute power and right to settle this tremendous amount of money in contracts.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will give the Senator entire credit, upon his statement, for sincerity and good faith in interrupting me. I know that he feels very strongly upon this question, and so do I; but let me point out to him—and I do not want to prolong this discussion; I simply want to finish my subject and get through with my speech, which I want to have go in the RECORD as a protest against the conditions which exist at the present time—but, answering the Senator, let me say to him that that measure which was enacted the other day provided that in the settlement of these contracts through the machinery of the War Department which has already been established, which has already been paid for by the taxpayers, if it failed in any way to do justice to the contractor, or failed in any way to do justice to the Government, there was an appeals commission, and it was provided that both the Government and the contractors could appeal to that tribunal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me again, I am glad to hear this statement of views on the part of the Senator, because I understand that in conference the appeals commission to which the Senator refers is about to be eliminated, and I feel sure that we will have the able assistance of the Senator in keeping in the bill that appeals commission, so necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in favor of the principle of the appeals commission. Of the method in which it was written in the bill I did not approve. I believed that the original jurisdiction should be in the War Department, a department to which has been appropriated \$34,000,000,000 by the vote of the Senator from Tennessee, a department which has been intrusted with all the war materials and all the war supplies, and which has the facts and the machinery for the settlement of these matters. I believe that the primary jurisdiction should exist in the War Department, although I believe in many cases they have been inefficient.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator understand that this same inefficient department of which he is speaking now demands that the appeals commission shall go out of this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I shall be very glad to support the Senator from Tennessee in seeing that it stays in the bill.

Who is responsible for the fact that many of our soldiers upon their discharge are compelled to turn in their best uniforms and go forth into the world, and back to their home towns and their family circles, wearing frayed, ragged, deloused uniforms, looking more like tramps than the trim defenders of a grateful country?

Mr. President, I have been handed a letter by a Senator from a western soldier returning home. He says:

Under separate cover I am sending you a pair of shoes. These shoes I have worn since last July in France, in the trenches, and upon my arrival in St. Louis they refused to give me a new pair. I was just wondering if this would be the treatment that the rest of the boys would receive when they return home after going through hell for Uncle Sam. I believe that if you Senators would put forth a little more effort looking up things of this kind, instead of a lot of things you do, you would be working in the right direction.

Mr. President, I do not want to be sensational, but I asked that Senator to give me one of that pair of shoes, and there it is [producing a shoe], and I will mark it "Exhibit 900,000" for the Senators on this floor to examine.

Who is responsible for the failure to adequately mark the graves of American soldiers in France? I am aware that there is an organization for this purpose, the Graves Registration Service, but I am convinced the work of that agency is not being properly performed, and that if existing methods are not improved, American families who have lost loved ones on the other side are doomed to receive a grievous shock.

A recent issue of the Washington Star contained a letter from Chief Justice Walter I. McCoy, of the District of Columbia Supreme Court, who lost a son in France. Judge McCoy states that his boy's grave is marked only with a wooden cross, and that the name, with initials omitted, which was written upon it, was almost obliterated by the rain and would soon have been indecipherable had not a visitor to the spot made it more legible. Judge McCoy concluded his letter as follows:

This communication may also warn those whose relatives are buried in France to take steps that will save them great distress of mind.

The judge says he attempted to have a simple stone placed on his son's grave, but this request was denied.

In behalf of the mourning kinsmen of those who made the supreme sacrifice in France I demand that the War Department take immediate steps to so mark the soldiers' graves that the names will not be obliterated by the spring showers, as they are likely to be under existing conditions.

Who was responsible for the condition of affairs at Walter Reed Hospital in this city, and similar institutions elsewhere, whereby crippled soldiers were compelled to do their own laundry work?

Who is responsible for the neglect of wounded soldiers on shipboard as set forth in a recent issue of the Washington Star, as follows:

According to the narrative of this witness, whose name can not be used because he is a soldier of the United States on reserve, no provision whatever is made for the care of one-armed and one-legged men. These must attend to their own wants or starve. No waiters are assigned them. No arrangements are made to help them into or out of their bunks, and no organized efforts are made to assist them in navigating the deck in bad weather.

"They must go to the mess room for their meals or go without them," said the returned soldier. "They are placed in the position of the hog who was told to root or die."

Who is responsible for the failure of camp and post commanders to comply with the instructions embraced in Circular No. 77, directing the discharge of any enlisted man who is "needed to resume employment in an industry or occupation in which there is urgent need of his services"?

A constituent of mine writes me as follows concerning the situation at Camp Dix, in my own State, where he has a son:

Camp headquarters company alone has at present about 350 soldiers, retained there for clerical work, with practically little to do. So little is doing, in fact, that the boys in khaki are instructed by their officers to pretend to be very busy whenever visitors appear upon the scene, whether there is anything in the nature of business or not. Such action, to say the least, is repugnant to the American ideas of honesty. My son informs me that less than a score of clerks could easily perform all the work. It therefore not only seems a shame but a rank injustice that this large force should be retained at camp headquarters, especially when it is known that the major part of them are high-salaried men at home, with their jobs open for them immediately upon their release from the United States Army.

I have a case before me of a young man at a post in North Carolina, who was employed as a draftsman by a shipbuilder, who now needs his services badly, and is urging his discharge. The commander of the post refuses, saying:

It is impossible at this time to discharge class A men, as this post is now below the minimum required for these defenses.

As a matter of fact, this corporal is a member of the band. Does the fort commander expect to maintain his "defenses" down in North Carolina by "soothing the savage breast" of the Tar Healers with music, or is he merely figuring on sufficient dance music for the gallant defenders of that advanced post?

Meanwhile, the shipbuilder is denied the services of this expert draftsman, and the family of the latter is compelled to live on a corporal's meager pay.

The War Department, it is true, is discharging soldiers by the tens and hundreds of thousands; but a reasonable degree of common sense and judgment should be exercised, to the end that soldiers badly needed in the industrial world should be given instant release.

Who is responsible for the order designating silver chevrons for the officers and men whose service was confined to this country, while the men who served overseas wear gold chevrons? Why is this distinction made? Is there any degree in the quality of sacrifice made when men left their business, their families, and their homes to go to camp and undergo the menace of influenza, pneumonia, and other dread diseases, whether they went to France or not?

Was there anything in their contract with the Government which limited their service to this country? No; they were under orders to go wherever sent, and they so understood it, and almost to a man were anxious to join the overseas army.

Nearly 2,000,000 American soldiers never saw France. Two million more did, but of this number 1,300,000 were not actually engaged, only 700,000 having reached the firing line.

Yet 2,000,000 men will wear the gold chevrons for overseas service, while nearly as many more will wear the silver chevron, though quite as patriotic, quite as brave, and quite as willing to go overseas as their comrades in arms.

Why should the War Department put this badge of disappointment on any American soldier and compel him to wear it? Give them all gold chevrons or take them off altogether.

Let every man be given a button to indicate his military service, and if a distinction is to be made let it be in favor of those who were on the front line only in France and actually under fire.

Some one has thus phrased his criticism of the War Department's discrimination:

Darling, here's your soldier bold!
Silver stripes instead of gold
Shine upon his sleeve to-day,
'Cause he did not sail away.
But, my darling, do not bleat,
For he did not get cold feet;
Simply did as he was told:
Silver stripes instead of gold.

I might, Mr. President, extend almost indefinitely this catalogue of the War Department's delinquencies in the treatment of our soldiers, who have sacrificed all the comforts of home for the rigors and dangers of military life, actuated by motives of the highest character.

Let me conclude the list by asking who is to blame for the fact that our soldiers when released from the service are not given proper discharge papers such as have been employed in previous wars—something strong, attractive, and altogether worth while—parchment, if possible—something to be shown to friends and relatives, hung in frames, perchance, and handed down to their children and their children's children?

Instead, if I am correctly advised, they are given flimsy slips of cheap paper, typewritten or mimeographed, which, when carried in the pocket for a few days, shrivel up to nothingness and find their way into some convenient wastebasket.

This, I take it, is but another evidence not only of the Government's unpreparedness, but also of the War Department's utter lack of a definite policy regarding the treatment of our soldiers as human beings rather than as mere cogs in the mechanism of warfare. The psychology of life seems never to have been recognized as an element in our Military Establishment.

The last communication I shall present for the consideration of the Senate is one from a citizen of Newark, in my State, who has been discharged from the military service, and who, recently, has come in contact, to a very considerable extent, with soldiers just out of the Army. The views he presents are so pertinent, and so suggestive as well, that I shall ask the Secretary to read the letter:

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

I trust it is not presumptuous on my part to write you about some of the matters that have been observed by me since I came home. I have been giving some assistance to the local city employment bureau endeavoring to find employment for soldiers and sailors who have been discharged from the service, and in this way have listened to a great deal of the soldier talk and sentiment.

There is considerable bitter talk about the Government and particularly of the War Department, and running with this is a lot of socialistic thought and expression, and mostly so from the men who have been across.

Their main complaint is that the Government took them away from their employment or vocations, has given them \$30 a month for war service, and then as soon as the armistice was signed has dumped them back in their own towns without a dollar in their pockets, and with the bottom dropped out of employment.

And then they will sarcastically refer to the amount of wages that have been paid in the shipyards and elsewhere whilst they have been away, and to the fact that the Government is going to charge off \$1,000,000,000 to profit and loss on the building of merchant ships, which never carried a ton of cargo or a single man across.

And the idea that has been suggested of giving employment to our soldiers in the construction of dams and reclaiming arid lands, or building roads—all unskilled labor work—has been somewhat repugnant.

The soldier that is coming back is generally a different man to what he was when he went away. I find, as a rule, he is very temperamental. He has had a peculiar experience. He was pampered until he felt that he was real man and one of the saviors of his country to be. He has been closer to his God than ever before. He has been away from newspapers and magazines and has been left a great deal to his own reflections; and the thoughts and ideas that have generated in the camps and trenches are the uppermost and most important to him, and a lot of his talk has been socialistic.

And then this soldier man knows of all that the British and French are doing for their returning soldiers, and he freely quotes the facts that the British and Canadians give 320 acres of land and loan \$2,500 to any veteran who wants to farm, and that they are giving \$750 to a veteran to finish a college course, and also that they are giving their veterans from two to six months' pay upon being discharged to purchase civilian clothes and give an opportunity to look around for employment, and he talks of the vocational schools that the French and British have established.

And the soldier man is sore because he has not been decorated, and he tells you that the British and French are all wearing their bars and medals, and he can not understand how it is that the Secretary of War is promoting officers who never left the camps, but can not promote those who were recommended for distinguished war service because the armistice had been signed.

And the soldier can not understand why civilian traffic managers and draft boards should be recipients of war medals when the man who has been in active service and under fire is not even suggested or thought of, except in such cases where the British or French Governments have decorated our men.

And I find that a large number of these soldier men have bought liberty bonds and don't even know how to get them—don't know who to apply to to have them delivered.

And the soldier man has been told to keep up his war-risk insurance by his officers and through orders and the press, but no one seems to know where he can pay the premiums after he is discharged.

These things in particular, but a whole lot of complaints about back pay and allotments which have been made public, seems to be the wall of the discharged soldier.

It was suggested at a meeting of service men held a few days ago in this city that the Government should authorize some kind of a button or distinguishing mark to be worn with civilian clothes by the veterans of this war.

I am writing this to you, knowing the interest you have taken in the American soldier, and knowing your aggressive spirit in behalf of justice and Americanism, and I feel sure that you will take some active measures to have something done to remedy these conditions.

It does not seem reasonable to me that the American Government should suffer in comparison with the British or French in the treatment of the men who have been fighting its battles, and the most unpleasant thought of all is that these millions of men should have any opportunity in the future to speak reflectively upon the treatment accorded them after they had made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The remarkable letter which has just been read I commend to the careful consideration of the Senate, the War Department, and the country at large.

In this plain narrative, Mr. President, I have extenuated nothing, nor has aught been set down in malice. I may not only assert that the half has not been told, but may go further and declare that the one-thousandth part has not even been suggested or hinted at bearing upon the crassly neglectful and inconsiderate conduct of the War Department in its treatment of our gallant soldiers, especially those who have "fought the good fight" to the best of their ability, have won, many of them, imperishable honors in active service, but are now treated as little better than derelicts, for whom the Nation has no further use.

How far this deplorable state of affairs is due to actual inefficiency and how much to that monumental lack of foresight and forethought which have always characterized this administration it is impossible for me to say. But the facts which I have presented are nothing but facts, and we know that facts are very stubborn things.

It is all very well, Mr. President, for us to felicitate ourselves as a Nation that the United States played a major rôle, in the final analysis, in the winning of this war.

It is all very well for the President to break the precedents of a century and a third, that he may head triumphal processions in foreign capitals, sleep in the chambers of royalty, dine off of gold plates in the palaces of the modern Cæsars, and have his photograph taken standing in line with kings, queens, and princesses. Those are interesting and perhaps alluring pictures. But what of the American private who returns to his native shores, unhonored and unsung, dismissed from the service, frequently without a dollar in his pocket? Is he entitled to less consideration than an old dray horse, his days of useful-

ness over, who is turned out into a green pasture and told to eat his fill?

No, Mr. President, until the War Department rises to the occasion, realizes that the private soldier is a human being, actuated by the same emotions which dominate presidents and kings, I am not in favor of granting the honor accorded alone to Washington, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan to any American soldiers now living.

When the privates and officers lesser than those referred to in the bill cited at the beginning of my remarks (S. 5278) are properly provided for, then I may consider the propriety of according higher honors to the heads of our Military Establishment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator speaks of it as the Chamberlain bill. If the Senator will examine the RECORD, he will find that at the time I introduced that bill I stated the fact, and it appears in the RECORD, that it was introduced at the request of the Secretary of War and not as emanating from me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will correct the RECORD by referring to it as Senate bill 5278. I stated in the beginning of my remarks that it was introduced by request.

Mr. President, I know it is a common practice to be intolerant in public criticism. I have endeavored to avoid this in my remarks to-day.

The Army has had a greater job than the Navy, and the difficulties have mounted high. Secretary Baker has done much to relieve serious situations. I believe that the War Department has been right intentioned, but conspicuously lacking in foresight.

I have endeavored to present to the Senate a picture of the situation affecting the common soldier that demands instant and drastic action. The Military Affairs Committee of this Senate and the Secretary of War should immediately confer and adopt some plan to alleviate existing conditions.

If in what I have said I can create a public sentiment and instill into the Secretary of War and Army officials a proper sense of their obligations to the men in the ranks, about to lay down their arms and return to civil life, I shall feel that I have rendered a public service.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I beg to repeat my opening assertion, that I am not willing to support the measure which has formed the text for my remarks, conferring the permanent rank of general upon the Chief of Staff and two other officers, and that of lieutenant general upon two or three more, until existing conditions in the Army are remedied—until adequate provision is made for subordinate officers who have rendered heroic service overseas, and for the rank and file of our splendid Army of fighting men.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. STERLING. I ask the Senator from Alabama to yield to me for just a moment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, in connection with the very able address delivered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and in connection with the correspondence which he has read and has had read at the desk, I wish to read an extract or two from a letter received from a lieutenant in France only yesterday. It calls attention to one particular phase of the failure of the Government to make payment to soldiers and discloses the reason for such failure. I read as follows:

The mail proposition has been the greatest curse to us all. A man can go without proper or sufficient food, march in wet clothing, or even fight without proper ammunition and equipment if necessary, but it is a mighty hard matter to keep up the morale of the men if they don't hear from home. Personally I went without mail for two months, during which time my wife was very ill. She sent me a cable October 22 that reached me December 6. I am in receipt of two letters to-day—

His letter is dated January 20—

written August 11 and September 12, respectively. Nor is this condition exceptional. The lad acting as my orderly at this time has not had a letter from his home in North Carolina since September 15; and I am certain that a good half of my company has been treated in like manner.

His reference to a cablegram reminds me of a cablegram sent under my own observation on the 15th day of January to a soldier boy belonging to the marines in France. It was plainly addressed, as many a letter had been addressed, to that young man. He writes a week later, and he had not yet received the cablegram announcing the death of his sister here in Washington.

Calling attention to that particular portion of his letter which refers to the pay and the reasons given for deferred payments, I read:

When a man is wounded the system demands that his service record be sent on to the hospital, and as it goes by mail it never reaches him, and as over half of this company has been through the hospitals nearly half of them are here without service record, as they have never reached here after being returned from the hospitals by mail. This means but one thing—every man who was wounded has not been paid since the last payment of his wages prior to receiving his wound. They do not pay a man who has no service record. A great percentage of our men have not been paid for over five months.

It is well known that there are temptations on all sides for the soldier, but I say most emphatically that if the morals of the boys have been affected no greater cause can be found than the deficient mail service. If the boy hears regularly from his mother he is better fitted to maintain his cleaner attitude toward life. In fact, Senator, this matter has grown to be a passion to me, because I have seen the effects first hand.

All I have to say further is that it will be a bad, a grievous, thing, indeed, if the boys who have enlisted with such a fine spirit of enthusiasm and patriotism and in a great cause should now have their morale imperiled and their ardor and patriotism cooled by reason of the fact that through this want of care, and one might almost say want of solicitude for their well-being, and want of supervision on the part of the War Department they have been and are yet denied the precious privilege of hearing from home.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, having listened to the lamentations of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] I am almost in doubt as to whether this country won the war or not. Did we win the war? How on God Almighty's earth did we win the war if the War Department is responsible for the mistakes, stupidity, and derelictions that have been charged and urged against it?

It is sometimes a wonder to me how we did accomplish this great achievement under the conditions that existed here in the United States Senate and in the Committee on Military Affairs of this body. At one time on that committee, I alone, of all the Democrats on the committee who attended its meetings, stood by the War Department against three of the most prominent Democrats on the committee, with the Republicans against it all the time, here on its legislative program on this floor.

Now, the Senator from New Jersey criticizes the War Department for what? For the alleged failure in mail service to deliver mail to the soldiers in the field; for the failure to pay the soldiers; for the failure to furnish hospital facilities; for the failure to pay insurance; for the failure to bury the soldiers and erect monuments, while the war was being waged and the Army was advancing, fighting victoriously.

All these things are charged, and what for? What can be accomplished now if there was proof of the allegations here and the charges made? Why is it all done?

The Senator has accused the War Department of being responsible for the severe winter last year. He has held the War Department responsible for the introduction of the epidemic of influenza into these United States and the failure to suppress it and to alleviate the condition of the people after it spread. Why is all that done, and where is there any foundation, in fact, for it?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I criticized the War Department for failure to take preventive measures in time for the influenza. I should like to have the Senator answer whether he denies the fact that soldiers' pay is being delayed?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not deny the fact that some soldiers have not received pay promptly, but I do deny that the pay of the soldiers as a body has been delayed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does he deny the fact that the Postal Service has broken down?

Mr. KIRBY. I deny it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does he deny the fact that allotments are delayed?

Mr. KIRBY. I deny it, so far as it relates to the great bulk of them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator will deal with facts, I am perfectly willing that he shall answer.

Mr. KIRBY. I shall answer you whether you are willing or not about the matter.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator from Arkansas will yield, I desire to say a word. I give the Senator from Arkansas entire and unrestricted credit for standing for the War Department at all times in the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, but I desire to say whenever there was any voting done by the members of the committee, I was there and invariably voted with the War Department, because I thought it was doing the best it could under the circumstances. I do not wish the Senator to be misunderstood.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, the criticism is not leveled at the Senator from Montana. The Senator from New Jersey criticizes the War Department for not furnishing trained nurses and physicians to men who have lost an arm or a leg and are coming home already recovered perhaps from the injury. He criticizes the War Department because of the lack of hospital facilities and beds here, when the papers say there are 50,000 more beds already provided than have been used by the returning soldiers. He criticizes the War Department for not sending the bodies of the boys who unfortunately died in camp home the next day or the day after. He criticizes the War Department for delay in the pay roll. He does not tell you, what all the country knows, that there were not enough trained nurses and not enough doctors in the great Capital City of the Nation even to take care of the sick people who were dying with influenza here. No; nor that there were not enough coffins to bury the dead here, regardless of conditions yonder on the battle front in France. Was the War Department responsible for that condition here? It seems that the Senator expected monuments to be erected at the graves of the soldiers there while the Army was on the march, advancing in the midst of the campaign, in the face of stubborn fighting.

He complains that maybe the soldier's name had been effaced by the elements from the rude boards that had been placed at his grave. He knows what the methods for identification of these graves are. He knows that the soldiers wear a metal tag upon the wrist and that there is a metal badge with his number on it put on the board at the head of the soldier's grave that connects him with all the information the War Department has about the soldier, from his enlistment to his burial.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Senator has quoted it as my statement. I simply read the statement of Judge McCoy, who said that he visited the grave of his son and found it improperly marked, and asked that he might erect a stone monument there—a marker—and was denied by the War Department that privilege.

Mr. KIRBY. After the war is won, he charges that the soldiers have not been paid, that they have not had proper medical attention yonder in the hospitals, that they have not had the attention of nurses, they have been insufficiently fed, and that the graves of those killed in battle have not been properly designated by monuments, and then he criticizes the method of discharge of those soldiers returning home from overseas—says it is not done as it ought to be done. It is not done as he thinks would have been the best method of doing it. What is the trouble with the method that is being used now? They are being discharged, are they not? Just as soon as they were being discharged here in great numbers, as the War Department expected to do, there comes a protest from the great cities, saying, "You must not discharge these men in such numbers or about our places. You must take care of the interests of labor, and not discharge men to such an extent that it will interfere with the labor market and create a surplus of labor in the cities." These are the conditions that have had to be met by the War Department.

Now, wherein is the War Department responsible for the epidemic of influenza that afflicted this country and the whole world? You would think it was directly to blame for it from the speech that has been made here on the floor to-day. How could it have been prevented? How could any one of these things been done better than it was done at that time? No man has risen on the floor and shown how it could have been done better than it was done.

It is easy enough to criticize when the entire program has been finished and when the war has been won. Yes; to say this, that, or the other might have been better done. From the sixty-three thousand four hundred and odd soldiers who went from the State of Arkansas to the war I have had complaints of about five who were not able to get letters from their homes at all; to be exact, I believe it was from only three. I have had only complaints from about a dozen or fifteen whose allowances have not been paid as they should have been paid and as they expected them to be paid, of the 63,400 of the Arkansas troops.

That is the sort of service which has been rendered, so far as I know. The people have not complained to me about these matters any more than to that extent. In the case of the four or five who had not been able to hear from their people for some time, notwithstanding the fact that their people here at home were hearing from them, I reported the matter to The Adjutant General, and he sent by courier across to the battle fields a message to the commanding officer, who was expected to deliver it to the soldier's company and to the soldier, telling

him that his family were well and were hearing from him regularly.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will state to the Senator from Arkansas that when I was in France last summer I took occasion to investigate the mail matter to some extent, and I learned while there that 21 per cent of the letters which were written to soldiers were misaddressed and that 350,000 bags of mail had been sunk in the ocean, which fact might account for some of the letters which failed to reach the soldiers to whom they were addressed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KIRBY. I do.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Senator state what time of the year that was?

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator from Kansas stated that 21 per cent of the letters had failed of delivery because they were wrongly addressed and that 350,000 sacks of mail had been sunk at sea.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. On what date was that?

Mr. THOMPSON. That was in July and August last.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Have any been sunk since?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not advised as to that; but I think so.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, if there were—

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is familiar with the fact that thousands upon thousands of letters written by parents to their sons have been returned to the writers, with the notation upon the face of the envelope that their sons were wounded, sick in base hospital, and so and so, and finally the letters were marked "Return to the writer"?

Mr. KIRBY. I did not know that; but I do not dispute it, if the Senator from Wisconsin states it to be the fact.

Mr. LENROOT. I am receiving such letters every day. The Senator says that nothing can be accomplished by protest; but I wish to say that I have received this morning a letter from the War Department—I having protested at some previous time—saying that orders had been given to discontinue the return of such letters to the writers, but to find the addressee and to deliver the letter to him.

Mr. KIRBY. I only mention these things because I thought something ought to be said here along the line on which I have been speaking. Some of these letters, it seems, have been returned to the writers here. What else was there to be done about them if they could not find the addressee on the other side? They have brought them back; but now they are again sending them across the ocean, it appears, in order that the addressee may be found. It may be that many of these things ought not to have been done—I am not saying as to that—but what shall be done now that the war is over? The soldiers are coming back; they are being discharged; and I assume that there is as much work and chance for employment in the United States to-day as there was before the war began. Certainly the number of returning soldiers is diminished by a much larger number than I thought it would be. Two hundred and sixty-three thousand of these soldiers will not be engaged in the same occupations in which they were employed heretofore. Of the 263,000, many of them are sleeping under the soil of France, having fallen on the battle field fighting gloriously for their country; others have been cut to pieces and crippled for life.

The industrial condition of the country still exists; its soldiers are here now, and it seems to me that they might be reabsorbed in industry within a reasonable time. It is said that we are more prosperous than we were before the war began, and that the only thing which now prevents the continuation of our industries as they ought to be operated is the failure by the War Department to adjust the existing differences between contractors whose contracts were canceled because the Government did not need the material contracted for, on account of the armistice, and necessarily had to close out the contracts; and because of the failure to adjust differences between those who had informal or invalid contracts, who had performed service and furnished materials for the Government and who ought to be paid for it. The War Department came to the United States Senate and to the Military Affairs Committee about three weeks ago asking authority to adjust these matters as they ought to be adjusted.

The industrial necessities and the commercial necessities of the country demand that these matters shall be settled as speedily as possible and as fairly as it can be done, both for the contractors and in the interest of the Government. The department suggested a method that would accomplish that. The subject was referred to the Military Affairs Committee, and they debated and wrangled and had subcommittees appointed.

Finally, after about three weeks, they came in here with a bill, of which only about four or five of the Democrats of the committee were in favor. Two of the prominent Democratic members have been fighting it all the way through since the bill came into the Senate. One of the Democrats asked the Senator who was making the speech, "Do you not think if the War Department has been as bad as you say it has been, if it has failed to perform its duties to the soldiers and to the Army, and has failed in service to the country, it would be a mistake not to establish a commission to settle these differences between the contractors and the Government instead of leaving the matter in the hands of the War Department, as you propose to do by your action?" He said, "No." Yet that Senator was the Republican who has raised all this howl about the deficiencies and shortcomings and failures of the War Department in the conduct of and winning the war. The other Senator making the inquiry was a Democrat, who expressed thereby his disapproval and distrust of the War Department to fairly settle for the Government's interest these claims, which must be settled soon.

I am not going to speak much longer, but it seemed to me some Senator ought to stand by the Government here after it has won the war; that some one ought to have an interest in the conduct of the soldiers on the battle field being properly presented, and in the country getting a correct view and having a proper appreciation of all the great objects which have been accomplished. If here and there a plan has failed or has miscarried, if here and there inconvenience, delay, and injury have resulted because of something not having been done as well at that time as it now appears it might have been done, why should it be made a record here as an everlasting monument to a single failure of the War Department, which, whatever else may be said, did win this war with the Army that it organized and with the Army that was sent abroad and which was furnished subsistence, munitions, and equipment by the War Department?

The soldier, of course, is entitled to vast consideration in the matter; he did the fighting and he won the war. The soldier's rights in the Army ought to have been regarded, and they were regarded by a Nation which had as great solicitude for its soldiers as had any nation now on earth or any nation that ever has been; which was shown by every single act done on the part of the Government to take care of the soldier's interest and to promote that interest while he was there part of the fighting machine on the battle front. The Government is still so disposed and attempting to do that.

Complaint is made about nonpayment of insurance of a man who had died; that his widow or his mother had not received the insurance. It has not been stated that the insurance had been demanded; it has not been stated that the War Department had been informed that the man was dead. It may be that such was not the case.

I took up a paper this morning, which is published down in my State, and noticed a report of a case where some soldier had gone home to his wife and his mother and found they had been collecting insurance on his life for the past five months. The War Department was a little too rapid in the payment of insurance in that case. The soldier was not dead, and yet the department had been paying insurance for five months to his mother and to his widow. I did not know anything about that until I saw it in the paper this morning.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. CALDER. I know a case along the line of the Senator's statement, where a woman received her allotment five months after her husband had been discharged from the Army.

Mr. KIRBY. Well, the woman got both the allotment and a husband in that instance. She was fortunate as to her allotment. But that is, of course, an isolated case. I mentioned the other case, which was also an isolated case, to show that the criticisms generally are unwarranted.

Now, I am not going to talk further about that matter. I say the achievement of this country, going into war at the time we did, a war 3,000 miles across the sea from home, a war against a powerful enemy that must be fought in the air, on and under the earth and sea, an enemy that had whipped the other great nations of the Old World to a standstill, a war that must be fought with an army that had not been organized, that must be transported in ships, that had not been built—I say the record

of our accomplishment has been marvelous under the conditions as they existed and as conclusively shown by the facts as they have been developed. The War Department, notwithstanding the criticisms that have been hurled at it here and there by the opposition on the other side of the Chamber and by some of the Democratic members of the Military Affairs Committee, is entitled to great credit and to the everlasting thanks of this country for its wonderful achievement, as is the Army for the glorious achievements upon the field of battle.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, while the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] was making a speech a short time ago I referred to some correspondence which I had had with the Postmaster General. It was a rather lengthy letter, and I hesitated about putting it in the RECORD or having it read at that time; but I now ask that it be inserted in the RECORD, for it is a voice directly from the administration, which controverts one of the points recently made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the letter presented by him may be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, January 11, 1919.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You called my attention the other day to your experience with the mail to and from the American Expeditionary Forces in France, and asked if I could tell you just where the trouble at this time is.

I am inclosing herewith a letter from an Army officer which will interest you and which, I think, goes right to the heart of the trouble, namely, lack of supervision, or supervision by officers entirely unfamiliar with postal work.

Sincerely, yours,

OTTO PRAEGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

[Copy.]

LA HAYMEUX, FRANCE, December 1, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. —: Just returned from an all-day visit to St. Mihiel, whither I went this morning on postal business, and as most of what I saw and did relates to the Postal Service, I think that perhaps I have more or less of the right kind of inspiration for a letter to yourself this evening. It was a long, cold ride both ways in a "Henry Ford," but I have succeeded in getting my feet fairly well thawed out beside madame's comfortable fireplace, and, barring the fact that my room is cold and I am wearing a heavy overcoat, I am all set for writing.

Just returned last night from a two days' absence at divisional gas school and learned that there was a big pile of mail over at our A. P. O. at St. Mihiel that was being held up from delivery on account of insufficient address. Had a "hunch" that probably some of mine might be in the pile, as well as many letters for other officers of the battalion, so secured the major's permission to go over to-day and try my luck at locating our share. Had very good success, and returned with two big bundles of letters for the officers and another big bundle for such of the men as I knew. Got back just at supper time and found all the officers together at our mess hall, and had all the sensations of a real Santa Claus for a little while. The fortunate ones were those who have only recently been transferred to the division. I do not know who is responsible for the stunt, but the mail for both officers and men has been forwarded from their previous divisions simply to the "Thirty-fifth Division." Of course, no one at the A. P. O. knows anything about where any of us are, and I found 30 big tiesacks full of first-class mail waiting for some one to come along and claim it. Found one lone private plugging along separating it alphabetically on a table. Don't know what they hope to do with it after it is separated. I spent most of the day going through the mess, with results as above stated. Found six letters for myself, including one from Cherry of October 26. Was very glad to hear from him and will answer soon. However, what I found in the beginning led me to kind of look over the whole establishment, and I found it generally pretty rotten. Out in the mail room I found Bernard Bradley and two other men who had been in the service over in the "Etats-Unis." One was on the Fort Madison and the other on the west division of the St. Paul & Portal. Needless to say we had a very good visit. I found these boys doing their end of it very well, but discovered that there was absolutely no supervision. There is a first lieutenant in charge of the A. P. O., but he was visible for only 10 minutes of the entire day. Reminded me of a postmaster in a first-class post office in the States. Said lieutenant has had no previous experience in the Postal Service, and to all appearances is attaining no present experience. Upon my return I made a report of conditions to the major, and he asked me to make up a written report on the situation. I am very willing to make the report but objected to signing it, lest I might get myself wished into the job of running the A. P. O., so the major agreed that if I would draw up the report he would sign it and send it up. Found no preparations have been made for handling the Christmas packages, which will undoubtedly begin to arrive very soon. Also discovered that whereas the A. P. O. is allowed a personnel of 20 men, it is running with only 14, and that no immediate increase has been thought of, "stuck mail" and Christmas to the contrary notwithstanding. Fine dope, and especially at a time when we are doing everything possible to keep the morale of the men at top notch. Most of the boys are looking forward to a return to America, while the probability is that they will soon be going up into Luxembourg or Germany. But there is nothing that will help so much in keeping their minds off their troubles as a prompt and regular mail service. I know, believe me.

Drop a line whenever you have time, and pass the word along to everyone else in the same connection. I think I will have the A. P. O.

shook up by the time the replies come along, so that the delivery will be entirely prompt. I am,
Very truly, yours,

American Expeditionary Forces, France.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am wondering how much longer my brother Senators are going to impose upon my good nature. I am going to ask them please to let us consider the business before the Senate, for a while at least, and see how much progress we can make. We were considering section 5 of the bill as amended. I now ask the Secretary to read the section as it has been amended, in order that the section may be adopted as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the section as it has heretofore been amended.

The SECRETARY. Section 5, as amended up to this time, reads as follows:

SEC. 5. That the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, is hereby amended to provide that the term "rural post roads," as used in section 2 of said act, shall be construed to mean any public road a major portion of which is now used or forms a connecting link, not to exceed 10 miles in length, of any road or roads now or hereafter used for the transportation of the United States mails, excluding every street and road in a place having a population, as shown by the latest available Federal census, of 2,500 or more, except that portion of any such street or road along which the houses average more than 200 feet apart: *Provided*, That section 6 of said act be further amended so that the limitation of payments not to exceed \$10,000 per mile, exclusive of the cost of bridges of more than 20 feet clear span, which the Secretary of Agriculture may make, be, and the same is, increased to \$20,000 per mile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, if we really are through with the speeches and are going to get down to business, I think we ought to have a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Sterling
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Sutherland
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Thomas
Colt	Kellogg	Overman	Thompson
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Kenyon	Penrose	Trammell
Dillingham	King	Pittman	Underwood
Fletcher	Kirby	Polindexter	Vardaman
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Saulsbury	Walsh
Gay	Lenroot	Shafroth	Warren
Hale	Lewis	Sheppard	Weeks
Henderson	Lodge	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott
Hitchcock	McKellar	Smoot	
Hollis	Martin, Va.	Spencer	

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] in attendance upon a committee of the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. I rise to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who is detained in connection with the work of the Committee on Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is the adoption of section 5 as amended.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to section 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment as amended the following:

That said act be further amended by striking out all that part of the last sentence of section 4 thereof after the colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "One-fourth in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-fourth in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census; one-fourth in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural routes and star routes in all the States at the close of the next preceding fiscal year, as shown by the certificate of the Postmaster General, which he is directed to make and furnish annually to the Secretary of Agriculture; one-fourth in the ratio which the amount of internal revenue paid to the United States by the tax-paying population of each State bears to the total amount of internal revenue paid to the United States by the tax-paying population of all the States at the close of the next preceding fiscal year, as shown by the certificate of the Secretary of the Treasury, which he is directed to make and furnish annually to the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask if that is an amendment to section 5?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The amendment which I have offered is an amendment to section 5 as found in the committee print of the bill. My amendment undertakes to change the method of allotting this appropriation to the various States, and hence I have framed the amendment so as to make it an amendment of the original act of 1916. The amendment amends section 4 of the act of 1916 in so far as that section deals with the allotment of these funds to the various States.

The Senate will recall that, under the plan of allotment as defined in the act of 1916, the funds are broken into three parts; one third is allotted to the States upon a ratio of population, another third is allotted to the States upon the ratio of area, and another third is allotted to the States upon the ratio of rural and star route mileage in the respective States. The only change in the method of allotment that I would undertake by this amendment to effect would be to break the appropriation into four parts, so that one-fourth would be allotted according to area, one-fourth according to population, one-fourth according to mileage of rural and star routes, and—this is the new idea—one-fourth would be allotted according to the tax-paying contribution of the various States.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KELLOGG. By "tax contribution" in the States, what does the Senator include—income and excess-profits taxes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. "Internal revenue" is the language used in the amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. What does that include?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That includes income, excess profits, corporation capitalization taxes, liquor taxes, tobacco taxes, and so on.

Mr. President, I am quite aware that if this appropriation were for a purpose that, to my mind, could properly be called a Federal purpose the sort of amendment I have offered would have no countenance at all before any reasonable man. The common burden of the Federal Government that belongs to all the States of the country must be borne by the people of the various States according to their ability to pay, regardless of State lines; but this burden which is attempted to be laid upon the people of this country, as I view it, is in no sense of the word a common Federal burden; this is a burden that the Federal Government takes upon itself in order to make a contribution direct to the State treasuries for local State purposes; and I say, that being the scheme, some attention ought to be paid, in the distribution of this bonus, to the amount of money the various States pay by way of Federal taxation.

According to the way I look at it, it is not an appropriation designed to meet a legitimate Federal need, I care not how it be described. We may call it, if we please, an appropriation to establish post roads, but that to me is a euphemistic term. I think, in the last analysis, it is an appropriation to the States to have them build roads, whether they are post roads or what not, although, of course, in order to justify the Federal appropriation, we must call them post roads. If it is a gift to the States direct, to the State treasuries, why, I ask, should it be that in the distribution of this money the equitable principle that those who pay ought to receive a proportionate benefit, at least in part, should be ignored?

Let me call the attention of the Senate to what is going to take place under this bill. I have made some figures here, which may be slightly, but, if at all, very slightly, inaccurate, because I have figured them hastily here at my desk.

The State of New York pays in internal revenue, or did during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, \$835,761,852.62. The State of New York will receive over the whole five-year program, out of all this \$275,000,000 for road purposes, the sum of \$13,692,821. It will take her five years to get that \$13,692,000, but in one year she pays to the Federal Government in internal-revenue taxes \$835,000,000.

I have on my sheet here a list of nine States. I will read them:

Arkansas, Mississippi, Vermont, Wyoming, South Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, North Dakota, and Nevada—nine States. They receive out of this road money, this \$275,000,000, over the whole five-year period for their road purposes, \$35,135,461. They paid \$29,985,943 internal-revenue taxes in the year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. President, this group of nine States receives from the Federal Government for these roads more money than it paid in 1918 in the shape of internal revenue, whereas the State of New York, which I have just mentioned, paid \$835,761,852.62

in the year 1918 and gets \$13,692,000. Now, as I figure it, the State of New York pays twenty-eight times as much money to the Federal Government in the shape of internal revenue in the year 1918 as do these nine other States, but these nine other States get back from the Federal Government two and a half times as much money as does the State of New York. Now, I repeat, when you consider this appropriation as a gift of money to the State—as pap, in other words, as pork—some attention ought to be paid to the proposition that those who receive this pork, and who largely pay for it, ought to get some portion of it on the basis of their payment.

The State of Pennsylvania paid in 1918 to the Federal Government \$589,056,143.20 in internal revenue. She gets over the whole five years \$12,632,849.94 out of the appropriated \$275,000,000. As compared with the nine States I have mentioned, Pennsylvania pays in one year nineteen times as much, and they get two and three-quarters times as much out of the road appropriation; and so I might go through the list.

The most forceful illustration of the injustice and inequity of this method of distribution is discovered when we look at my own State of Delaware. Delaware is not the smallest State in point of area. Rhode Island is smaller.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was the disproportion, if any, as to the amount of war contracts that Delaware got as compared with the nine States with which the Senator is comparing now?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is a specialist on these contracts. He has been very laudably industrious in rooting out unconscionable contracts made with the War Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am talking about the conscionable ones now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Just a moment. I defy the Senator from Tennessee to find an unconscionable contract made with any of these so-called profiteers that he has been hunting for that hail from Delaware. If they have made a contract it has been an honest contract, and they have given honest value for every dollar they have received.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WOLCOTT. Just a moment; I am going to answer the Senator. Furthermore, if the State of Delaware has gotten contracts from the Federal Government, I say that the State of Tennessee has not unduly contributed thereto in the way of taxes, nor have these other nine States, because the money did not, in the main, come from these States in the way of taxes to the Federal Government.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not talking about unconscionable contracts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, is a legitimate contract an undesirable thing in war times?

Mr. McKELLAR. But I want to say to the Senator I believe that the amount of contracts that have gone from the National Government to citizens of his State shows quite as wide a discrepancy in favor of his State as this appropriation shows in favor of the States he has mentioned.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That may be true or it may not be true. I should like to have the Senator satisfy himself by figures that it is true before he makes the assertion; but, if it be true, what of it? It simply means that the State of Delaware has business brains there, has business energy, and business thrift that put it in a position where it is needed by the Federal Government in time of great emergency. That is all it means. It is not a disgrace to Delaware; it is quite to her credit.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are taxing the rest of the country, though, to pay for these contracts which have gone to the people of Delaware.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are not taxing these nine States to get it. The State of Delaware pays to the Federal Government in internal-revenue taxes more than do these nine States all put together, and she pays more than any one of 27 States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Largely out of war profits.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If anybody has a complaint, it is New York and Massachusetts and Ohio and Illinois and other States that bear the great burden of taxation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The people of Delaware pay the taxes out of the war profits on contracts that have gone to the State.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, it is being spent in the State of Tennessee. While I have not the figures, Mr. President, I dare say that for every dollar that has been spent in the State of Delaware Tennessee has had \$500. They have Army camps there, I believe; they have cantonments there; they are building great munition mills there. The Senator from Tennessee ought to be

the last to rise here upon this floor and assail the State of Delaware because it has gotten some business from the Federal Government. It is not to the discredit of the State of Delaware, but quite to her credit, if she can be of service to the Government in the time of her need.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wanted to ask the Senator if it is not true that contracts went to Delaware because there were people there who were able to fulfill the contracts?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is exactly what I said a moment ago.

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear the Senator say it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I said that they went there because they had the people there who could fulfill them, and could furnish what the Government wanted, and could not get elsewhere.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. The conception of the Senator from Tennessee seems to be that there will be a certain amount of money in the United States Treasury, and the purpose is to divide it among the States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, if it were proper to divide it and it were done according to business merit and business ability to do things, by means of which the Federal Treasury receives its tax money, the basis of division would have some legitimate merit.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. Do I understand that the Government has spent or is now spending at Muscle Shoals, which I believe is in Tennessee, some \$53,000,000, or nearly twice as much as the Senator states the nine States have contributed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I thank the Senator for the contribution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I must say to both Senators that they should look up their geography. Muscle Shoals, unfortunately, is not in Tennessee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Tennessee can very well afford to give up Muscle Shoals and then have plenty left.

I started to point out the unfortunate situation in the State of Delaware. Delaware is not the smallest State in area. Rhode Island is smaller. The State of Delaware is not the smallest in point of population. Wyoming and Nevada are smaller, I believe, in point of population. Delaware, however, gets the smallest sum out of this public pork that we are carrying up here. I speak of it as pork for that is the way in which I regard it.

Mr. KING. We all think of it that way.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Delaware gets the large sum, over a five-year period, of \$447,748.91.

The amendment that has been introduced here, as I caught it from the desk, allows the Federal Government to expend \$20,000 a mile on these roads if that is matched by a State contribution of a like sum, which will be a \$40,000-a-mile road. I may say that the last road I heard of as being built in Delaware cost \$48,000 a mile. That was in war times. But let us say, if you please, that the roads will cost \$20,000 a mile. Delaware, as a pacifier, is allowed \$447,748.91, which, I think, at \$20,000 a mile, will build her about 20 miles of road. Now, Mr. President, in one taxable year Delaware contributes to the Federal Government internal-revenue taxes of \$32,943,383.27. Delaware contributes more than do all these nine States that I have mentioned. They contribute \$29,985,943.56 in one taxable year as against Delaware's \$32,943,383.27. She contributes nearly \$3,000,000 more than do all these nine States; but when it comes to dividing the money, these nine States take \$35,135,461.21 and hand Delaware \$447,748.91. Delaware contributes in one year of taxes \$3,000,000 more than they do, but they get eighty times as much out of the road money as does Delaware. Illinois contributes twelve times as much in annual taxes as they do, and they get nearly three times as much of the road money as she does. Ohio contributes ten times as much in annual taxes as they do, and they get nearly three and a half times as much of the road money as she does. Massachusetts contributes six times as much in annual taxes as they do, and they take over three and a half time as much of the road money as she does. I could not run my figures beyond that, to embrace a comparison with other States, because while compiling them the time for me to introduce my amendment arrived and necessitated stopping my calculations.

Mr. President, I am perfectly frank with the Senate. I am free to say that if my amendment is written into this bill I do not know that I will vote for this appropriation, because I am in sympathy with the idea that the time has come when we have got to think about the outgo in our operations and we have got to think about it seriously. Two hundred and seventy-five million dollars to me is a large sum of money.

Three and a half times that sum of money reaches approximately a billion; and only a short time ago a billion-dollar Congress was denounced in all the newspapers of this country as a most extravagant body, and a national campaign was fought upon the extravagance of that Congress. Here, toward roads, we propose at this time, when there is a great want of money, and untold and indescribable and inconceivable sums of money demanded, to appropriate as gifts to States, to help them do that which they ought to do themselves, \$275,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I say, if my amendment is written into this law, I am not sure that I will vote for it then; but I do say that, viewing it as I do as a contribution to the States, a gift and nothing more than a gift, to subserve a State and a local purpose, when we come to contribute the Federal money for that purpose let us pay some attention, at least to the extent of a fourth of it, to the proposition that the States that give the bulk of the taxes ought to get back their proportionate share of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If I understand the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, it means that the States which pay a certain amount of the revenue shall get back a certain proportion of that revenue.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Out of one-fourth of it. It seems to me I am really more generous than I ought to be, entertaining the view of this appropriation that I do. According to my proposal, as embodied in this amendment, one-fourth should be apportioned according to area, as I have already stated; one-fourth should be apportioned according to population; one-fourth should be apportioned according to mileage of rural and star routes; and I am suggesting by my amendment that the other fourth be set aside to allow the operation of this equitable principle, namely, that those who pay as to that fourth ought to get their proportionate share back. That is the scheme that I offer.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. According to that doctrine, it would be poor encouragement for the western country, which has built up such States as Delaware, to continue along that line. I think a more proper way would be to base it on something like the mileage of the different States, because—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a fourth of it is based on mileage.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If these Western States that built up such States as Delaware and New York and the rest of these States are not permitted to share fairly well in the road proposition, it will not be treating them equitably, in view of the fact that you could not have accomplished what you have in the past without their assistance.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator is taking great credit to his western States, which he claims to have been building up Delaware and New York and other States. Delaware was living and thriving and doing quite well as a State in this country when the Senator's State was nonexistent; as a matter of fact, she was the first State to come into the Union. Her star was the first to appear in the flag's blue.

The Senator is entirely mistaken, however, when he assumes that there is no attention paid to mileage. Under the amendment I have proposed, ratio, based on mileage, is recognized. Three-fourths of this fund, under the amendment as I propose it, will be apportioned just exactly as the whole fund is apportioned by the committee. As to the remaining fourth, I introduce a new method of apportionment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that the Senator from Delaware is an absolutely fair man, and, as he said awhile ago, even a generous man. He mentioned Tennessee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not disparagingly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all, and I thank the Senator; and I am not mentioning Delaware disparagingly at all. It is a great State. Her people are a great and prosperous people. However, I just wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact that while it is true that the powder plant which he mentioned was built by the Government near Nashville, in Tennessee, the Delaware corporation that built the plant made enough in profits to pay nearly all of this tax, coming from Delaware, I imagine, quite a large amount of it, anyhow. You ought to be generous about it. The Government has been kind to Delaware in the matter of contracts. She ought not to complain about taxes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I defy the Senator to establish that proposition. As a matter of fact, that corporation built that powder plant without a dollar of profit. According to the last contract I saw, they undertook to build it without making a dollar of profit. If they operated it, they were to be compensated. That was the contract as I saw it; but they never got to operate it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have always understood that the compensation was pretty generous for war times. This Delaware corporation probably can get along and pay the tax, even including the tax on roads; and I am quite sure that it will be fair and just and equitable. I am not criticizing that corporation at all. I understand it built a very fine plant in Tennessee, though I have never had time to go out to see it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I am not complaining of any tax that any Delaware corporation pays, nor is any Delaware corporation complaining. It is not a question of taxation at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to begin to enforce the rule. A Senator who yields the floor for any other purpose than a question is going to lose the floor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am very glad the Chair warned me that the rule would be enforced.

The Delaware corporation to which the Senator refers is not involved in this thing at all; and I assert that the Senator, before he makes the statement that he does respecting the operations of that corporation in the State of Tennessee, ought to have the facts before him; and when he gets them here I shall be prepared to make it clear to any man who is open to reason that that corporation has been the most patriotic and most effective corporation in the United States of America during this war.

I wish to say no more, Mr. President, on the amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, did I understand that the Senator had yielded the floor?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was about to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question before he takes his seat.

I notice that the Senator provides in his amendment—I thought I could find the language here, but I can not do so at the moment—in substance that one-fourth of this money shall be distributed on the basis of the amount of internal-revenue taxes paid by the different States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can find it in the amendment if the Senator will hand it to me a moment:

One-fourth in the ratio which the amount of internal revenue paid to the United States by the tax-paying population of each State bears to the total amount of internal revenue paid to the United States by the tax-paying population of all the States at the close of the next preceding fiscal year, as shown by the certificate of the Secretary of the Treasury, which he is directed to make and furnish annually to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to ask the Senator why it would not be preferable to base that on the total assessed value of all taxable property within the State. I ask the question for this reason: It seems to me that the administration of it would be very much simpler if the wording I suggest were used instead of the collection of the tax by the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That would hardly be satisfactory. I would not care to accept that amendment, because if that suggestion be adopted we are getting back more or less to the idea of ratio based on area. It is very easy to ascertain from the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of internal revenue paid by each State. The commissioner's report shows it for 1918 and shows it for every year. I think the basis for arriving at the figures is absolutely definite and certain, and I am afraid that the method suggested by the Senator from Utah would approximate too closely to the apportionment on the basis of area.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I want to get away from that, and if the Senator will read my proposed substitute for this he will find out that I did get away from it, I think, by using the words "the total assessed valuation of all taxable property." That takes in every bit of property which is taxable within the State; and it seems to me that that is a much fairer basis than the amount of internal revenue collected.

For instance, many of the States now are "dry." Other States are "wet." They pay a great deal of taxes there in that way, and if the valuation of the property were taken as the basis it would take in not only the property in that State that was used for that purpose but it would take in property in another State that was used for other purposes, and take in every conceivable piece of property the value of which is assessed; and it would be, I think, a fair distribution of that amount.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I had not seen the Senator's amendment when I drew mine, but I thought the Senator took account of income taxes, which are derivable not directly from real estate or tangible property, under his scheme.

Mr. SMOOT. Under my scheme the valuation of the property that produced that income is the basis for the distribution of that one-fourth.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The great objection that I see to that is that there is much income that is not produced directly by property. It is produced by many other things.

Mr. SMOOT. It has to be produced by property in some form or other, however.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate for a moment to the basis of division or award proposed by the Senator from Delaware. He proposes, as a one-fourth basis, the internal-revenue taxes paid in the State. Now, the greater part of those taxes come from excess-profits and income taxes; and for two reasons nothing could be more unfair.

Let me illustrate: The income and excess-profits taxes of corporations are paid wherever they happen to have their general offices, and that is usually in New York, or some other big eastern city. Let me illustrate with the United States Steel Corporation. According to the latest report of the Internal Revenue Department, the State of New York for the year ending June 30, 1918, paid, in round numbers, \$685,000,000 of income and excess-profits taxes. Over \$200,000,000 of it was paid by the United States Steel Corporation, and practically the only property it has in the State of New York is its office furniture. Now, where is that property situated? It owns many corporations, scattered over many States. In my State are situated the principal mines of the United States Steel Corporation, and they pay their taxes on all of their income in the State of New York, and it is credited by the revenue collector to the State of New York.

I have not access, of course, to the books and returns of the corporations and individuals in the office of the internal-revenue collector; but I think you will find that these big manufacturing and mining companies and railroad companies over the country pay their taxes at their general offices in the city of New York, in the city of Philadelphia, in the city of Boston, and in other cities. Such a division of the road fund, therefore, would be absolutely inequitable.

The State of Minnesota pays only \$58,000,000, or did last year, of excess-profits and income taxes. I have not the slightest doubt that the mining companies on the iron range alone pay more than that. I have not the figures available, but I know something of the output of the mines in the State of Wisconsin, in the State of Minnesota, in the State of Michigan, and the big manufacturing companies whose offices are in the eastern cities, and it is more or less the same with all the Western States.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am not sure that I apprehend the purpose of the Senator's argument or the point he is seeking to make, but I want to inquire if the State, regardless of the place where the taxes are paid, may not impose a tax upon the mines to which the Senator refers which would enable it to get a fair return for the product of the mine and the profit of the mine.

Mr. KELLOGG. The State taxes all the mines by a direct tax for State, county, and city purposes. I am not talking about the merits of the appropriation. I am talking about the basis of division.

There is another reason. Take the income taxes. The amount of income taxes actually paid in a State does not depend upon the average wealth of the State. That is a very small factor. It depends more upon the enormous wealth of a few great corporations and very rich men. That is perfectly evident. Take the State of Iowa. Per capita the State of Iowa is one of the richest States in the United States. It is like Minnesota, a great agricultural community. It has not the big mines that Minnesota happens to have, but the average wealth per capita in the State of Iowa is probably as great or greater than the average wealth per capita in the State of Pennsylvania or the State of New York.

But because there are large incomes and the income-tax provision takes a big percentage of those incomes above certain amounts, therefore this fund would principally go to those States where these taxes happen to be paid. Such a basis, it seems to me, can not be defended. I do not know but a better basis than the one in the original bill could be found. The basis is one-third based upon earnings, one-third upon population, one-third upon the mileage of the roads in the State. As

to those taxes not included within the income and excess-profits taxes, I am not able to say how fair that would be, but the internal-revenue taxes other than the excess-profits and income taxes are very small and would not be much of a factor in the distribution of this fund.

I ask permission to insert a table as a part of my remarks, so that it may be printed in the Record. Senators have asked to have it printed.

There being no objection, the table referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Receipts, income, and excess-profits taxes, year ended June 30, 1918, by collection districts.

[Taken from the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.]

INDIVIDUALS, PARTNERSHIPS, AND CORPORATIONS.

Alabama	\$23,155,406.25
Arkansas	5,731,398.42
California:	
First district	\$59,482,172.24
Sixth district	17,743,915.34
Colorado	77,226,087.58
Connecticut	25,875,792.33
Florida	78,576,260.30
Georgia	4,639,716.09
Hawaii	16,230,449.09
Illinois:	8,961,868.47
First district	251,576,061.33
Fifth district	5,734,263.18
Eighth district	9,614,816.16
Thirteenth district	8,653,915.73
Indiana:	275,579,056.40
Sixth district	21,576,167.87
Seventh district	7,478,776.77
Iowa, third district	29,654,944.64
Kansas	14,972,211.59
Kentucky:	25,943,912.41
Second district	2,056,616.23
Fifth district	10,488,025.25
Sixth district	3,340,394.94
Seventh district	2,811,429.67
Eighth district	2,250,482.72
Louisiana	20,946,948.81
Maryland	21,807,341.85
Massachusetts, third district	76,318,192.62
Michigan:	166,598,752.86
First district	58,610,263.93
Fourth district	12,451,044.19
Minnesota	71,061,308.12
Missouri:	58,218,134.48
First district	43,956,247.49
Sixth district	16,056,705.93
Montana	60,012,953.42
Nebraska	11,496,084.28
New Hampshire	11,335,082.21
New Jersey:	21,924,598.54
First district	17,575,286.41
Fifth district	54,236,198.47
New Mexico	71,811,484.88
New York:	7,982,321.53
First district	36,196,347.30
Second district	410,953,932.80
Third district	123,502,045.03
Fourteenth district	34,698,997.75
Twenty-first district	23,952,084.38
Twenty-eighth district	50,345,867.90
North Carolina:	685,649,375.16
Fourth district	6,878,372.78
Fifth district	13,369,662.96
North and South Dakota	20,248,035.74
Ohio:	4,307,830.15
First district	40,994,666.73
Tenth district	22,344,727.24
Eleventh district	17,355,970.03
Eighteenth district	190,332,285.66
Oklahoma	241,027,649.66
Oregon	18,263,262.07
Pennsylvania:	10,070,079.46
First district	162,892,494.10
Ninth district	14,626,597.40
Twelfth district	25,904,964.11
Twenty-third district	292,457,320.34
South Carolina	495,881,375.95
Tennessee	7,884,094.31
Texas, third district	14,172,718.62
Virginia:	30,313,161.81
Second district	10,195,698.40
Sixth district	11,209,519.80
Washington	21,405,218.29
West Virginia	19,575,384.13
Wisconsin:	45,548,830.46
First district	31,434,390.72
Second district	7,758,180.58
Total	39,192,571.30
	2,838,999,894.28

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it seems to me we would make time by considering section 6 and disposing of it before proceeding further with section 5. Let us determine first whether this plunder is to be voted. If we do not vote it, there is no need of spending time in quarrel about how it shall be divided. I consequently suggest that we consider section 6 first, in order that we may be able to get somewhere before adjournment to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] to the amendment. The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

On a division, the amendment of the committee as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 3, to insert the following as an additional section:

Sec. 6. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said act, as herein amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following additional sums: The sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and available immediately; the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; and additional sums to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That in the expenditure of this fund for labor preference shall be given, other conditions being equal, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to submit a point of order upon section 6. Section 6 provides for an appropriation of \$200,000,000 as an added sum which is in addition to the \$75,000,000 appropriated two years ago for the building of good roads. It is admitted that this proposed increase was never submitted to the Committee on Appropriations. Subdivision 2 of Rule XVI reads as follows:

2. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner, amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Commerce; also amendments to bills establishing post roads, or proposing new post roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

That subdivision refers to three matters—first, general appropriation bills; second, river and harbor bills; third, bills establishing post roads. This is a general appropriation bill. It is moved by the direction of a standing committee. It proposes to add a new item of appropriation of \$200,000,000, and is therefore clearly within the provisions of the rule. I make a point of order against it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. The point of order is that this proposed appropriation was never submitted under subdivision 2 of Rule XVI to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Amendments to the Post Office appropriation bill are referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and not to the general Appropriations Committee. The point of order is therefore overruled.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hollis	Martin, Va.	Smoot
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Spencer
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sutherland
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Swanson
Cummins	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Penrose	Trammell
Fletcher	King	Polindexter	Vardaman
France	Kirby	Pollock	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Pomerene	Walsh
Guy	La Follette	Shafroth	Weeks
Hale	Lenroot	Sheppard	Wolcott
Harding	Lodge	Simmons	
Hardwick	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	
Henderson	McNary	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to reserve the right, if I may do so under the rules, to renew the point of order in the Senate, which I have made heretofore unsuccessfully, to section 5 and section 6.

Mr. WEEKS. I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it read.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, after the word "act," on line 13, insert:

Provided, That 10 per cent of the cost of the construction of good roads which has been undertaken and completed by the several States since January 1, 1900, shall be paid to said States from the appropria-

tion provided in this section: *Provided further*, That such payments to the States shall be, within one year from the date of its receipt, expended for new construction in said States.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am in general sympathy with the view expressed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Worcott] relative to the distribution of this fund if a fund is to be distributed. My own judgment is that the building of good roads is of essentially local concern; that the States should build their own roads, or the counties, or the towns, I am not particular which, but they should be built by those who are directly benefited by their construction.

There are some States that have spent a great deal of money in constructing roads. Other States have spent comparatively little. This kind of legislation is a direct handicap on those States which have been diligent in providing for their own needs. They not only have constructed at their expense their own roads, but now they are asked to furnish money to construct the roads in States which have not undertaken it. It is an unfair proposition even if it is a wise one, and, in my judgment, some parts of this money should be returned to those States that have been progressive, that have been looking forward and have been providing for the needs of their own people by constructing the good roads which their people need. Therefore, I offer the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senate will not adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. This principle of national aid to roads has been very carefully worked out, and it has been adopted and acted upon by every State in the Union. While it may be true that some States have built better roads than others, while it may be true that they have been enabled to build better roads than other States, they can not overlook the fact that great, rich, powerful States like New York and Massachusetts have been drawing continuously for 50 years from the balance of the country, and thereby they have accumulated their wealth. The great State of New York has been the gateway through which the commerce of this whole country has passed, and it has been gathering in, going and coming. I do not object to that. I am glad that the State of New York and the city of New York and the other States have so prospered. They own everything in this country, practically. All our railroads are owned by these gentlemen.

I do not object to that; I am making no complaint about it; but my contention is that if the bill as we have reported it can be adopted, if these increases in the appropriations can be accepted and the law as amended and as it has been accepted by all the States of the country can go into operation, we will have an era of road building in this country such as we have never enjoyed before; and the result of all that will be that the States which have not heretofore been financially able to build good roads, for which they are being criticized, will be given an opportunity to build roads and develop their lands and develop their resources. They will then be much more able to contribute to the State of New York and the State of Massachusetts and add to their wealth than they have heretofore been, and we will make them immensely rich if they will allow us to do it.

I hope the amendment to the amendment will not be adopted. I do not think my good friend from Massachusetts is really serious about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be again read.

The SECRETARY. Insert in section 6, after the word "act," where it occurs in line 13:

Provided, That 10 per cent of the cost of the construction of good roads which has been undertaken and completed by the several States since January 1, 1900, shall be paid to said States from the appropriation provided in this section: *Provided further*, That such payments to the States shall be, within one year from the date of its receipt, expended for new construction in said States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume it is not the intention of the supporters of the committee amendment to accept any such amendment as that offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Alabama has just stated that this matter had been very carefully worked out. It certainly has.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Shall I lose the floor if I yield to the Senator from Alabama, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator should lose the floor by yielding, I shall not insist on interrupting him, but I simply desire to ask a question. I am not quite sure that I understood the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Do I understand that the Senator means to go back to 1900 and to pay 10 per cent for 19 years?

Mr. WEEKS. I mean that of the money that has been expended by a State since 1900 in the construction of its roads—and, of course, it applies to all States—10 per cent of it shall be returned to those States and be used for additional road construction in those States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thought that was it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, there is one phase of this situation suggested by the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to which I wish to direct attention. Let me say before I embark upon a very brief discussion of it that I am not at all in love with the provincial character that this discussion has assumed. It is not particularly pleasant to talk about what State is getting the better of some other State, what State is getting too much money, and what State is paying the money. The poor old State of New York is constantly referred to as a source of riches and wealth. I am not going to comment upon that in particular, although I have some ideas about it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama forgets a few things, or perhaps he is not informed of them, when he discusses the matter in the way in which he did a moment ago. The Senator from Alabama and other Senators seem to forget that the State of New York and some other States—but I happen to know about that State—tax themselves at an infinitely higher rate to make these internal improvements than do the people of other States who refrain from making any internal improvements. I say in all seriousness to the Senator and to any others who are interested in this problem that the State of New York is now faced with a most difficult and perplexing situation, for the very reason that it has gone ahead and spent approximately \$150,000,000 upon its roads and nearly \$150,000,000 upon its canals, and has embarked upon other great public improvements which have been demanded by the people of that State and have been sanctioned by referendums in many instances by the people of that State.

As the result of embarking upon these improvements, the people of the State of New York are actually faced with the highest local tax rate, in the aggregate, in the Union. While they are faced with that tax rate, the Federal Government steps in and makes it all the more difficult for them to arrange their finances by invading their field of taxation and duplicating the taxing efforts of the State by the imposition of certain kinds of Federal taxes. That may not excite any sympathy from the Senators who come from States which are not so rich in the aggregate as is the State of New York; probably this statement will not make a vote against the amendment of the committee, because it is perfectly apparent, as I have listened to some of this discussion, that there are Senators here who do not care about the local problems of certain other States in this Union.

The budget of the State of New York has grown since 1905 from \$26,000,000 a year to a budget of \$82,000,000 a year in 1918. The wealth of the State has not multiplied by any such ratio in that period; the population of the State has not increased by any such ratio during that period. This vast increase in the expenditures of the State is due to the fact that the people of New York determined to take care of their own affairs and agreed to tax themselves. We are to-day per dollar of valuation of property of all kinds in the State taxing our people at an infinitely higher rate than do the people of Alabama or the people of Nebraska or the people of Tennessee. But the limit has been reached.

It is a very grave question whether or not the State can develop any further sources of taxation. The Federal Government has invaded our field of taxation with respect to inheritances. We can not get another penny from inheritances. The Federal Government has duplicated the State tax in effect, and no longer can the State of New York, to meet its own local expenditures, hope to get any money from that source. The Federal Government steps in and puts its taxes on the incomes of corporations. The State of New York prior to that time, and, I think, still to-day, has the highest corporation tax of any State in the Union. If it has not the highest, it has one of the highest. So it goes from one thing to another in the matter of taxation.

Now this bill simply adds to the burden—it is one of the many bills that add to the burden—another \$275,000,000 to be taken from the Treasury of the United States, and the taxes of the people of New York must be raised even higher than they are to-day, when they are already higher than the taxes of the average State in the Union.

The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] described to me a rather interesting incident that occurred, I think, at Harrisburg during the recent inauguration of the governor of

Pennsylvania. I bring it to the attention of the Senate to show how this thing is drifting. I believe it was stated by the recently elected governor in his inaugural address that the money collected from the State of Pennsylvania by Federal taxes during the year preceding his inauguration was greater in amount than all the money required to support the State of Pennsylvania since it became a State in the Union.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. The governor of Pennsylvania also showed that one-sixth of the Federal revenues are paid by Pennsylvania.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is probably true.

Mr. PENROSE. A few days ago I had the statement put in the RECORD.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I know that comparisons are odious; I am not contending that because Pennsylvania pays one-sixth of the revenue she should have one-sixth of the roads, or that because New York pays 40 per cent of the revenue it should have 40 per cent of the roads.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I want to ask the Senator if he can state what the average rate of State taxation is in his State; that is, the State and county taxation, aside from municipal taxation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was very familiar with those figures when the original act which this bill proposes to amend was before the Senate, and I gave them at that time. It was rather astounding, even to me—and I knew something of the high rate of taxation in New York at that time—to find that a dollar in value in New York was taxed much higher than a dollar in value in most of the States of the Union.

Mr. STERLING. Aside from municipal taxes, would the rate be as much as 3 per cent on the assessed valuation for county and State taxes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have to include in the average the municipal taxes also. They all come out of somebody's pocket.

Mr. STERLING. That is true, but—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not say what the percentage is, but I make the statement that it is infinitely higher than are the tax rates in many other States.

Mr. STERLING. The municipal tax rate, of course, involves the idea of the benefit of living in a city, and so forth; but take the average rate of tax paid by the farmers in the Senator's State—the county and State taxes—what will it amount to?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I could not tell the Senator the average, but I will guarantee that the rate is higher than that of other States.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New York to one of the reasons why the tax rates are higher in New York and in Massachusetts and why there is abundant reason, at least, for making a comparison with other States. In the expenditure of all these moneys for building roads and for other purposes State debts have been incurred, and they are particularly pronounced in the case of those two States. The total debt of all the States in the Union in 1913 was \$403,000,000, and of this the State debts of Massachusetts and New York were \$227,000,000; in other words, a greater State debt was incurred by those States in building roads and for other purposes than by all the other States in the Union together.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, I am certain, is correct, of course, because he reads it from the accepted figures.

Mr. WEEKS. These figures are taken from a statistical abstract.

Mr. STERLING. I am not in a position to make comparisons between the rate paid in New York and the average rate of county and State taxes; but I am strongly of the impression that the rate is not so high as it is on our Western States—as it is in the State of South Dakota, for example. Taking the rate on personal property, farm property, and farm lands, I think it is higher on the assessed valuation than is paid on similar property in the State of New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not, of course, enter into any controversy with the Senator from South Dakota on that point, because I do not know the rates in South Dakota and for the moment I have not the New York rates before me; but I am of the very clear opinion, Mr. President, that the time is coming when some of the so-called rich States, instead of being rich, will be the poorest States in the Union from the taxpayers' standpoint.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just one moment. I know the State of New York is now confronted, and has been confronted for the last two years, with perhaps the most difficult situation faced by any other State in the matter of raising money to pay its expenses, in spite of its alleged wealth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the same disproportion the Senator complains of exists in the Senator's own State. For instance, New York City pays taxes out of all proportion to the taxes paid by the remainder of the State. I know that is so in my own State. The city of Memphis pays one-sixth of all of the State taxes of the State of Tennessee, and that same proportion exists throughout our entire system.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is mistaken about the city of New York paying taxes out of proportion. It pays taxes in the State of New York in proportion to its wealth, and incidentally the proposal to incur the greater portion of these expenses, such as those for good roads—in fact, all the expenses under the good-roads item and under the barge canal item—was submitted to a popular referendum of the people of the State, and the city of New York voted overwhelmingly in favor of both projects.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has just been referring to the unfortunate financial condition of the State of New York and to the difficult problems confronting it. Upon the principle that misery loves company, I think I may assure him that if we keep on a little longer the Nation will be in the same condition.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My own opinion is that certain of the States will starve first and the Nation afterwards at the present rate of expending money. The Federal Government, of course, has the last opportunity to do the taxing, and it can supersede apparently, as laws are now framed and passed, the taxing powers of the States by one method or another. The States are gradually toppling under this continual increase of Federal appropriations, and one of the signs of the toppling is that more and more as the years go by do the people of the States ask the Federal Government to come to their aid and spend money out of the Federal Treasury, which, incidentally, according to my view of the matter, means the atrophy of local ambition, spirit, and civic pride. We are tending in that direction every day the Congress sits. We have commenced to starve some of the States—not all of them—in the matter of their local revenues, and we are spending the money in other States, and encouraging the appetite that is growing so fast in this country amongst millions of people for money from Washington. This is but one instance of it.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is germane to this exceedingly difficult problem. The State which I happen to represent in part has spent \$150,000,000 on roads. It has spent that amount primarily for the benefit of its own citizens. They voted to do it and they bonded the State, and, in addition, the counties have also bonded themselves for large sums. We spent it also for the benefit of people passing through the State, whether it be for business traffic or pleasure traffic. We can carry that burden with perfect ease, I believe, if we have left to us the field and resources of taxation, but the Federal Government is taking them away from us with nearly every tax bill that passes Congress, and we have this great burden placed upon us. So the time has come when the people of that State, as I happen to know—and it has been reflected in public sentiment pretty strongly, Senators, for the last few years—are insisting that a halt be called to Federal appropriations; otherwise their local burdens, coupled with their Federal burdens, will break down their State finances. It can not be carried much longer.

It may seem to some a surprising suggestion that emanates from the Senator from Massachusetts, to wit: That some of the States be reimbursed for some of these public improvements. But the time may come when they will come here on their knees and beg you to give them money to help them. It is not a laughing matter; it is not a trifling suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, although it may be a little ahead of time; but the time will come when these burdens can not be borne any longer.

That is one of my objections to the proposal in this bill that at this time, when the people of my State, as well as the people of other States, are burdened with taxation to an extent never before known in this country and with no immediate outlook for relief, the Congress shall appropriate \$200,000,000 more to add to that burden and give no benefit through the expenditure of this particular \$200,000,000 to millions and millions of people who are suffering from heavy local taxation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to ask the Senator if he means to intimate that the rate of Federal taxation is any greater in the State of New York than in any other State of the Union?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I did not say anything like that; I did not mention the rate of Federal taxation. I mentioned the local taxes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. As I understood the Senator, he was complaining of the special burden being put upon the State of New York by virtue of this provision of the pending bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken. I did not say that the rate of Federal taxation was greater in New York than in any other State. Of course, that would be absurd; it is not. I say the people of New York and of many other States have assumed of their own volition a very heavy tax burden, and when they assumed that burden they felt certain that their local sources of taxation would be reserved to them; but in recent years they find that the Federal Government has invaded their field of taxation and has made it literally impossible for them to raise any more money from those sources to meet their local bills, and the more money the Federal Government appropriates in the manner suggested by this bill, the heavier becomes the burden of those people.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to ask the Senator if the Federal Government has invaded any field of taxation in New York which it has not invaded in every other State in the Union?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course, the Federal laws are general in character, but not all the States in the Union by any means impose an inheritance tax; nor such a heavy inheritance tax as is imposed in New York. If the rate on inheritances in Ohio is the largest, perhaps New York is the second; but the inheritance tax in New York was a heavy tax, and was meant to be, to help pay the debts of the State; but along comes the Federal Government and doubles it. That means that New York can never get any more from that source. That is not the only instance; there are others; in fact, the starving process has started, and yet the burdens of taxation continue to rise. Had some of the States which are supposed to be wealthy known that this tendency in Congress was going to make itself so powerful, we would not of our own volition have shouldered this burden locally. We would have waited for Washington to give us the money, as other States have waited.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will allow me a moment—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the rates of Federal taxation are the same everywhere; there is no question about that; but the rates of collection are very different. Federal taxes are collected with great thoroughness in some parts of the country and very imperfectly in others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment reported by the committee. By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I want to offer to this section. I send it to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, at the end of line 15, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and add the following:

Provided, That so much of the appropriation apportioned to any State under the said act approved July 11, 1916, or under this section, for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available for expenditure in that State until the close of the second fiscal year succeeding the close of the fiscal year for which such apportionment was made, except that amounts apportioned for any fiscal year to any State which has not a State highway department shall be available for expenditure in that State until the close of the third fiscal year succeeding the close of the fiscal year for which such apportionment was made.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I will say that the effect of that amendment is this:

Under the existing law the succeeding year after the apportionment is made, if the State or local authorities do not furnish their half, the money goes into the general fund for redistribution the next year. A great many of the legislatures will

not meet this year to furnish, if this bill passes, the half that the States have to furnish. All that this amendment does, instead of confining it to the succeeding year, is to put the requirement for the second year one year later before the redistribution is made.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator allow the amendment to be printed and lie on the table and take it up the first thing in the morning?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; that will be all right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 6, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 5, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, exercise, we beseech Thee, Thy holy influence to safeguard the home-loving, peace-loving, law-abiding citizens throughout our Republic from the influence of evil-minded men and women, who, by their glib tongues and seductive harangues, are going over the country seeking to stir up strife, discontent, and hatred among their brethren who love the flag and all the sacred principles which it represents; whose objects are to overthrow our Government, that they may get something for nothing.

Inspire, we pray Thee, the legislative assemblies throughout every State in the Union and the lawmakers at the Capitol to pass laws which will drive them from our midst and keep them far from us.

Ours is a people's government and the people have it in their power to rectify mistakes and remove abuses without dynamite, fire, and the sword. So let us live in peace and harmony and practice the precepts enunciated by the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BENJAMIN C. GREENE.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, unless this is in order on Calendar Wednesday, I suggest that the motion be made to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday to-day be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business for to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. We are to have a meeting of the Republicans in the House at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The gentleman told me that yesterday, and I told him I would move to rise at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman then move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. He will go into it as soon as he can. [Laughter.] Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there are only three Calendar Wednesdays remaining before the final adjournment of Congress. The call is on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has several important bills which can not be considered at this session of Congress unless an opportunity is given to reach them on Calendar Wednesday. For that reason, last night I objected to unanimous consent at the expense of Calendar Wednesday. In view of the fact that some of my constituents are interested in the relief proposed in one of these bills from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I feel it is my duty, Mr. Speaker, to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with business in order on Calendar Wednesday to-day.